UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
3 1761 01878795 2

MISCELLANIES.

BY

HENRY EDWARD,
CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

VOL. III.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES, Ld.
1888.

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

I. PAGE

IS THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870 A JUST LAW? . 1

"Nineteenth Century," December 1882.

II.

THE WORKING OF THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870 UNEQUAL: THEREFORE UNJUST 23

"Nineteenth Century," February 1883.

III.

IS THE CHRISTIANITY OF ENGLAND WORTH PRESERVING? 47

"Nineteenth Century," April 1883.

APPENDIX:

TO AMEND THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870 . . 79

1886.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A COMMON SYSTEM OF NATIONAL EDUCATION 87

August 1887.

THE FUTURE OF THE PRIMARY SCHOOLS . . 91

"The Month."

IV.

AN ENGLISHMAN'S PROTEST 97

"Nineteenth Century," August 1880.

THE PARLIAMENTARY OATH AND THE GOVERNMENT 108

ATHEISM AND THE CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND . 113

V.

AN ENGLISHMAN'S SECOND PROTEST . . . 119

"Nineteenth Century," 1880.

VI.
PARLIAMENTARY OATHS . . . . . PAGE 129
"Nineteenth Century," 1880.

VII.
WITHOUT GOD, NO COMMONWEALTH . . . 142
"Contemporary Review."

VIII.
S. FRANCIS OF SALES 167
"Dublin Review."

IX.
WILLIAM GEORGE WARD 175
"Dublin Review," 1882.

X.
THE SALVATION ARMY 189
"Contemporary Review," 1882.

XI.
WHY ARE OUR PEOPLE UNWILLING TO EMIGRATE? 207
"Murray's Magazine," 1887.

XII.
OUR NATIONAL VICE 227
"Fortnightly Review," 1886.

XIII.
HISTORY OF THE PAPACY DURING THE REFORMATION 241
"Dublin Review," 1887.

XIV.
A PLEADING FOR THE WORTHLESS 257
"Nineteenth Century," 1888.

XV.
HENRY VIII. AND THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES . 277
"Dublin Review," 1888.

XVI.
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND MODERN SOCIETY . 303
"North American Review."

XVII.

PAGE

THE WORK AND WANTS OF THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND 329

"Dublin Review," 1882.

XVIII.

OUTDOOR RELIEF 369

"Fortnightly Review," 1888.

XIX.

THE LAW OF NATURE DIVINE AND SUPREME . . 377

"The American Catholic Quarterly Review," 1888.

XX.

COMPENSATION TO THE DRINK TRADE . . . 389

"Fortnightly Review," 1888.

XXI.

THE SOUL BEFORE AND AFTER DEATH . . . 401

Bacon's "Unknown Land," New York, 1888.

XXII.

THE CHURCH ITS OWN WITNESS 431

"North American Review," 1888.

I.

IS THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870 A JUST LAW?

(*Nineteenth Century*, December 1882.)

IS THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870 A JUST LAW?

To propose the repeal of the Education Act of 1870 would be like proposing the repeal of the Gregorian Calendar. We cannot go back twelve days behind the rest of the world.

The Act of 1870 was necessary. The population had outgrown all existing means of education. The children uneducated counted by hundreds of thousands, perhaps by millions. The standard of education was on a low level. England was behind both Germany and France in the diffusion of intellectual culture, at least among the lower and middle classes of the people.

The principles embodied in the Act of 1870 cannot be rescinded; they ought rather to be carried out to their full and complete application.

The principles and intentions may be stated as follows:

1. That education, whether by voluntary schools or by rate schools, shall be universal, and co-extensive with the needs of the whole population.

2. That an education rate shall be levied in all places where the existing schools are not sufficient for the population in number or in efficiency, and that such

rate shall be administered by a board elected by the ratepayers.

3. That the standard of education shall be raised to meet the needs and gradations of the people.

4. That all schools receiving aid, whether by Government grant or by rate, shall be brought under the provisions of the statute law.

5. That all such schools shall be under inspection of Government, and bound by all minutes and codes of the Committee of Privy Council as sanctioned by Parliament.

6. Lastly, it has been since that date enacted that education shall, under certain conditions and for certain classes, be compulsory.

Now, these principles have been so long admitted, and have worked themselves so deeply into public opinion and daily practice, that no scheme or proposition at variance with them would be listened to.

The condition thus made for us being irreversible, our duty is to work upon it and to work onward from it for the future.

Assuming, then, that the principles of the Act of 1870 are good and their results beneficial, the promoters of that Act cannot but desire that it should be carried out to its fullest extent. If this be so, then, in the first place, let the education rate be levied upon the whole population.

Putting away all ecclesiastical questions, it cannot be denied that the State is justified in providing for the education of its people. It has a right to protect itself from the dangers arising from ignorance and

vice, which breed crime and turbulence. It has a duty also to protect children from the neglect and sin of parents, and to guard their rights to receive an education which shall fit them for human society and for civil life.

If the civil power has these rights and duties towards the people, it has the corresponding rights and powers to levy upon the people such taxes or rates as are necessary for the due and full discharge of such duties.

But correlative to these rights of the civil power are also the rights of the people. If the Government may tax the whole people for education, the whole people have a right to share in the beneficial use of such taxation. An education rate raised from the whole people ought to be returned to the whole people in a form or in forms of education of which all may partake. If any one form of education can be found in which all the people are content to share, let it be adopted; if no one such form be possible, let there be as many varieties of form as can with reason be admitted. No one form of religious education would satisfy Catholics, Anglicans, Nonconformists, and unbelievers. No form whatsoever of merely secular instruction will satisfy the great majority who believe that education without religion is impossible. Therefore, if no one form can be found to satisfy all, many and various forms of education ought to be equally admitted, and equally allowed to stand on the same ground before the law. This does not mean that every individual or every caprice may claim a share in the

education rate; but that every association or body of men having public and distinct existence, already recognised by law, should be recognised also as a unit for the purposes of education, and, being so recognised, therefore admitted to a participation in the education rate; reserving always to the Government its full inspection, and to the ratepayers their due control and audit of accounts. But of this in detail hereafter.

Having thus cleared the ground, and made it impossible that any one should say with truth that they who oppose the way in which the Act of 1870 has been hitherto carried out oppose the Act itself, or that they are friends of darkness, or that they would hinder the education of the people, or that they ask for public money to spread their own religious belief, we may go on to see in what the present way of carrying out the Act is open to the censure of inequality and injustice.

1. First of all, the exclusive enjoyment and control of the education rate is given to one only class of schools, which represent one and only one form of opinion, and that form which is repugnant to the majority of the people of the United Kingdom—namely, that such schools should be only secular, to the exclusion of religion. The exclusion of religion excludes the vast majority of the people from those schools; and such schools, being exclusive, are truly and emphatically sectarian. And here, lest I should seem not to know, or, knowing, to omit to say, that the Bible is read now in the majority of Board Schools, I cite the fact to prove that religion is not taught in them. All doctrinal formularies and catechisms are

expressly excluded by the Act of 1870. But religion without doctrine is like mathematics without axioms, or triangles without base or sides. I heartily rejoice that the life, and words, and works, and death of the Divine Saviour of the world should be read by children. But that is not the teaching of religion, unless the true meaning and the due intrinsic worth of all these things be taught. But this would perforce be doctrinal Christianity, prohibited by law. There can be no mathematics without precise intellectual conceptions and adequate verbal expression. The undergraduate who went into the schools with a general notion of his Euclid was plucked.

2. But, secondly, the school rate presses unequally on the rich and on the poor. On the poor it is a sensible burden, on the rich it is absolutely insensible. For so great a sensible burden the poor ought to receive a sensible benefit.

3. Thirdly, the Board Schools were avowedly intended to receive the children of the poor. But the character of the Board Schools has been gradually so raised that the poor children are thrown upon the voluntary schools, and the Board Schools are largely frequented by the children of the middle class. The poor, therefore, so far, are paying for schools in which their own children are not taught, and the tradesman's children are educated on the rate paid also by the poor. The London School Board has now proposed to found schools of a higher standard. I heartily go with the desire to provide such schools, but it is removing them still further from the poor and still further into the middle class.

4. Fourthly, the amount of money spent by the School Boards out of the rate, and by loans upon the rate, amounts in ten years to about 13,000,000*l*. There has been no doubt profuse and needless expenditure, for gold may be bought too dear, and money may be wasted even in education, but nevertheless education is, if not the highest, at least inseparable from the highest interests and duties of a commonwealth. Education is vital to the commonweal. No amount of money really needed for the education of the millions that cannot pay for their own education ought to be thought too much, if only it be expended with due care and prudence, and if all who pay share equally in the benefit. But this is not so at the present time. It is of this inequality that we complain, and this inequality is a grave injustice.

5. Fifthly, the injustice will be seen to be still graver and more glaring if we compare the manner in which voluntary schools and Board Schools have been dealt with since the Act of 1870 became the law of the land.

There are at this time two sources from which public money flows into the work of education. The first is the Consolidated Fund, out of which since the year 1838 the Committee of Privy Council has made grants to voluntary schools. The second is the school rate created by the Act of 1870.

Now, in the grants from the Consolidated Fund both voluntary schools and Board Schools share equally. The two classes of schools can earn according to the same minutes and codes fixed by the Committee of

Privy Council. Thus far the voluntary schools and the Board Schools are on equal terms; so far they stand on the same level before the law. But here ends equality, and here an inequality, which nothing can justify, begins. The voluntary schools are absolutely and altogether excluded from the school rate. The founders and managers of such schools must buy sites, erect buildings, pay teachers, bear all costs of management out of their own self-denial.

The School Boards have exclusive enjoyment and control of the school rate. With the public money they buy sites, erect buildings, pay teachers, and all costs of management, without contributing a sixpence by free gift or self-denial. On what principle can this be justified?

The voluntary self-denial of those who founded and maintained schools before 1870 had expended millions of money of which there is no accurate record. They were, till 1870, the sole educators of the people. Parliament was lagging behind. It voted a paltry 600,000*l.* a year for education. Every year 1,200,000*l.* at least was contributed by voluntary self-denial. The voluntary schools in 1870 were about 8000 in number, and were educating 1,700,000 children. Nevertheless, there were perhaps a million of children, as we were told, without education. Who was to blame? First, every successive Government and Parliament which had neglected this great obligation and overlooked this crying need. Who next was to blame? All those who, by apathy and want of generous self-denial, had never taxed themselves, or

opened heart or hand, for the education of the people. They, *colle mani alla cintola*, looked on while others laboured. Who alone were not to blame? The founders and managers of voluntary schools, who in those dreary and starving days greatly denied themselves, and founded all that England had of primary education. And what has the Act of 1870 done?

It has done nothing for those who by their self-denial had created the national education of England.

And it has done everything for those who had never done anything for the country or for themselves.

It has endowed with the school rate those who had done nothing, and it has excluded those who had hitherto educated the people of England from participation in the school rate, to which they are also nevertheless compelled to pay.

Let nobody deceive himself by saying that they are not excluded: that the education of the Board Schools is open to them, and the refusal is their own. We have not forgotten the fox and the crane. The School Board has the cunning of both. It spreads an abundant feast, but in platters and bottles where we cannot touch it. The offer of the Board Schools to the people of England is: "We will teach your children if you will give up religious education." Christian parents answer: "You can force us to pay your rate, but you shall not rob our children of their religion." The education formed under the Act of 1870 falls entirely into the hands of those who desire to exclude religion from the education of the English people. In time past half the population was untaught, because the secularists had not zeal and self-

denial enough to found voluntary secular schools ; and now they have been rewarded by an Act which endows schools without religion at the joint, if not the chief, cost of those who, by energy and generous self-denial, have created the national and Christian education of England mainly at their own cost.

6. It would be difficult to find in all our recent history a more unequal and unjust condition. I am aware that the framers of the Act of 1870 did not intend to bring about this great inequality. The refusal to allow voluntary schools to share in the school rate was a subsequent exclusion. It might have been foreseen as certain to come, and it has now rooted itself for these ten years.

Who can doubt that in the long-run the system which rests on the inexhaustible school rate will spread more and more, and the system which rests on the self-denial of men of various conditions and classes, with all their vicissitudes of life and fortunes, will grow less and less : that is, that the "supplement," as it is called, will become the system, and the system will sink into the secondary rank of a supplement ; or, in other words, that schools without religion will be the national schools of Christian England, and the remnant of Christian schools will be a tolerated survival of the tradition of English Christianity ?

7. Already this inverted process has begun to work. Many schools have been handed over to the School Boards by Nonconformists, and some also by clergy of the Established Church. To hand them over saves money, trouble, and anxiety. Nothing but zeal for

education or for religion will stand out against this temptation. Ill examples are quickly followed. Ill examples are on the inclined plane. To go down is easy and alluring. Good examples of effort, self-denial, and generosity tax the will, the spirit, and the perseverance of men. Some, we may hope, will keep up to the effort; many will give way. In ten years the compact strength of to-day may be broken, and the earnest resolution of the last ten years may be relaxed.

8. A further and more dangerous inequality is this. The School Boards have power to place a Board School in any locality in which, according to their judgment, subject only to the Committee of Privy Council, sufficient means of education do not already exist. The Board School once opened, no new voluntary school can be formed. Take an illustration of this inequality. In a given place where a Board School exists, a sudden influx of people, as in the manufacturing or mining districts often happens, comes in. They may be either Church of England people, or Catholics, or religious Wesleyans. Their existing schools upon the spot are not large enough, or as yet they may have none. By the present practice the permission to found their own schools might be refused to them; and by the compulsory powers of the School Board their children might be forced into the Board Schools. In this way the "supplement" has the power of continual expansion, thereby preoccupying the face of the country and blocking out all voluntary schools. Moreover, it appears that sites for Board Schools are being bought up in districts which as yet are not built over. When they

are inhabited, the Board School will be in possession against all comers.

9. When it is borne in mind that the Board Schools are without religion, and that the voluntary schools are the Christian schools of Christian England, we shall have some idea of the change which has already begun stealthily to work among us. Who can doubt of its inevitable ascendency in virtue of exclusive privileges and an inexhaustible command of the public money?

In order to measure this danger let the following statistics be well weighed. The voluntary schools from 1838 to 1870 had provided school room for about 1,800,000 children. Between 1870 and 1880 they had added 1,800,000 more, making in all about 3,600,000. The School Board in the ten years since 1870 have expended nearly 13,000,000*l.*, and have provided school room for 1,000,000 children. The resources of the voluntary schools are limited. Government does not grant a shilling for new sites or new buildings. The Board Schools have the inexhaustible school rate to draw from year after year for these purposes.

If every ten years shows an expenditure of so many millions, what is to check the universality of Board Schools? The voluntary system rests on free will alone: the School Boards are armed with compulsory taxation and compulsory education.

I may be asked, then, What would you propose? I will answer in two sentences:

1. Let a school rate or tax be levied over the whole population as a part of the general taxation of the country.

2. Let all schools, with or without religious teaching, partake in the school rate, as they partake now of the grants of the Consolidated Fund, under all the conditions of the statute law and of the minutes and codes of the Committee of Privy Council.

These two propositions change nothing in the Act of 1870; for extension is not change, but rather completion and fulfilment.

To this proposal the following objections have been made:

1. That it would be granting public money for religious teaching. This is plainly and patently contrary to fact. The Government has reduced voluntary schools to the condition of secular schools. No religion can be taught in the school hours; no religious books can be used. In what, then, do they differ from Board Schools? The Board Schools teach no religion, and draw from both sources of public aid. Let the voluntary schools in like manner draw equally from both for the secular instruction only. The Government grants no money for our religious teaching; it does not pay a sixpence for it. The Government buys of us our secular instruction at half-price. It buys the same of the Board Schools at double the price. Schools, on an average, earn one-third, or, say, one-half of their cost. Will anybody venture to say that the religious teaching of our schools costs the other half? For instance, a school costing 300*l.* a year, we will say, earns 100*l.* Do the other 200*l.* go for religious teaching? *The religious teaching costs nothing.* It is freely given by our clergy, or by our

teachers out of the school time. The maintenance of our schools would cost precisely as much if no religion were taught in them. The teacher's salary could not be less if he taught no religion. Therefore at this time the voluntary schools have three burdens on them: (1) they support themselves; (2) they have to pay school rate; (3) they have to sell their teaching to the Government at half-price. All this is so obviously and glaringly unjust that it seems as if the exclusion of the voluntary schools from the school rate were simply *in odium Christi*. It is contrary to fact and truth to say that the public money would go to the teaching of religion. If the schools were as purely and exclusively secular as the Board Schools, they would cost to a fraction as much as they do at this moment. If their whole cost were paid out of the school rate, not a fraction would go to the religious teaching. But the founders and managers and teachers believe and maintain that the education of a Christian people must be Christian; and for this heterodoxy they are mulcted by exclusion from the school rate.

2. But, again, it will be said: The voluntary schools choose their own teachers. And perhaps the Board Schools do not choose their own teachers? Surely this is a wanton objection. Is it an honest one? If the secular teaching of voluntary schools be equal to the secular teaching of Board Schools—and from the Government Reports we know that within decimal points it is so—why should not the selection of the teacher be with the founders and managers of the voluntary schools? The Government avowedly looks

only to the secular teaching, and treats our schools as secular schools. The objectors parade their schools as exclusively secular; so far as the law takes cognisance, our schools are equally secular. Moreover, we show equal efficiency in secular teaching, and yet the Government gives to the Board Schools, out of grants and rates, not double only, but an enormous excess over the pittance we earn by equal efficiency. This is really mulcting the voluntary schools, because with equal secular efficiency they also, at other times, and by other means, teach Christianity. In what does the selection of the teacher affect the claim of the school to fair and equal treatment, if its secular results are what they ought to be?

I have said that the efficiency of the voluntary and the Board Schools is equal. From the last Government Report I find the proportion of passes in the voluntary and the Board Schools as follows:

	Voluntary.	Board.
Reading . . .	88·86	89·31
Writing . . .	79·79	83·16
Arithmetic . . .	74·17	79·33

And this is the competition of schools starved by exclusion from the school rate against schools surfeited with public money. The average stipend of teachers in the voluntary schools would not be 150*l.*; in the Board Schools it is not less than 250*l.* a year.

3. But further, it has been said: If a share in the rate be given, the ratepayers must have control. Why not? At this time Government gives aid, and has control over the whole secular teaching of our schools.

It has control also over the financial, material, and sanitary management of the school by a vigilant and close inspection. The school rate, in like manner, would go only for secular teaching. Let the ratepayers share with Government in the inspection of these things. At this time the industrial and reformatory schools founded by voluntary effort, and aided by grants and by rates, are visited by the Government inspectors and by those of the School Boards. At this time the diocesan schools, founded and supported by voluntary efforts, in which are children transferred from the district schools of the Poor Law, are visited closely and vigilantly, not only by the inspectors of the Local Government Board, but by all the boards of guardians in the metropolitan district. They pay out of the rates for the maintenance of their children, and they come at all times with or without notice, and investigate everything, writing their commendation, or blame, or requirements in a book. If voluntary schools were aided out of rates, the due application of such rates would be, in like manner, open to the inspection of the ratepayers.

4. Lastly, it is said that this would be concurrent endowment. I answer, if it be endowment, then the Board Schools are already endowed; and if they be endowed, then a glaring injustice has been done. The State has endowed the education of those who had done nothing to educate the people of this country; and it has endowed exclusively a kind of school which the majority of the people cannot enter. If it be endowment, then the ill example has been set by those who

cry out against endowments and would disendow the Established Church. They would disendow its schools while they are endowing their own. I do not deny that there is some look of truth in this talk of endowment. But I have shown, that as the enjoyment of grants and rates is exclusively for secular instruction in Board Schools, so it would be strictly and exclusively in the voluntary schools, no religious teaching being paid for, or even estimated in the costs of such schools. In answering these objections, I have not been able to clear my mind of the thought that those who make them are impelled rather by unwillingness to admit others to the rate, than by the force of reason. Is it that they fear that the energy, and zeal, and self-denial of the voluntaries, if they only had fair play and equal aid from the public revenues in grants and rates, would outstrip the Board Schools in multiplication and efficiency? I am firmly persuaded that this would be the case. And I must affirm that the voluntary system is a moral power which no public money could create. It is zeal against hire. It is the unbought energy of those who gladly spend, and are spent, for the commonweal. It is free service and free gift against paid service and public money. This noble and national force of beneficence Governments can paralyse, and starve, and destroy; but they cannot create or rekindle if they should insanely destroy it.

A great American has said that the Americans are "the most common-schooled, but the least truly educated of people." May it never be said that the English are the most "board-schooled of people;" for certainly

we should then be the most heartlessly educated and the least Christian of people.

I will now very briefly enumerate the reasons why I believe such an extension of the Act of 1870 ought to be made.

1. First, because the people of this country, so far as they have yet been able, have pronounced decisively against merely secular instruction. In all School Boards, with the exception of a few, it has been resolved that the Bible shall be read and explained in their schools. This covers about 12,000,000 of the population, and the schools in that area have 800,000 children. Add to this the whole mass of the voluntary schools—Anglican, Catholic, Wesleyan—by which religion and doctrinal Christianity are sedulously taught, containing at least 2,000,000 children, and it may be said that the whole people of the country have declared themselves for religious schools.

2. I say so far as they have as yet been able to speak; for the Parliament of 1870 was not elected on an Education cry, but on a cry for the disestablishment of the Irish Church. The Liberation Society and its political allies went in with enthusiasm against the first wing of the Tudor House, which then was tottering, in the hope of shaking also the other wing in due time, and then ruining the body. It was, therefore, a Parliament ready for schemes of secular education. *Omne majus continet minus.* The disendowment of religion contains the endowment of secularism, as the greater includes the less. But for this political crisis it may be doubted whether the Bill of 1870, as it stands,

would have ever become law. If at the next general election the constituencies were fairly asked, Will you have secular or Christian education? I believe, and, until the contrary is proved, I shall continue to believe, that a vast majority would declare for Christian schools.

For the reasons here too briefly and hastily given I must affirm, that the working of the Act of 1870 has resulted in grave injustice to those who had been labouring to create the great system of Christian and national schools, while the advocates of secular education were doing, and had done, nothing for the instruction of the people. It excludes them from the benefit of the school rate; it lays on them the double burden of paying to support a system of schools which they in conscience cannot frequent, and also further of maintaining schools of their own; it results in a growing danger to the Christian education of England. Until 1870 the tradition of Christian education in England, however thwarted and obstructed, had never been broken. For the first time it was broken then. A generation is growing up, formed in secular schools, in which, if the brain is stimulated, the heart, the conscience, the will, and therefore the character, cannot be formed. England is a Christian people, and its national character is Christian, because it has hitherto been formed and perpetuated by Christian schools. How can this English and Christian character be perpetuated or formed when the schools have ceased to be Christian? If any one shall say it will still be formed in the homes of the people, such an answer is either from ignorance of what the homes of our millions really are, or from a levity of

mind. It is, then, the Christianity of England and the national character of Englishmen that are at stake. These things are too vital to be tampered with by politicians, and pedants, and parties. If, with the state of France before us, we will not look before, and either retrace our steps, or avert by timely wisdom the dangers we have created in these last years, then assuredly we shall incur, as we shall well deserve, the same political and social decline which has paralysed the character and dissolved the unity of that great people.

From the year 1838 to this day, the subject of education has been treated piecemeal, in the vicissitudes of political strifes, by alternate Governments and by contending parties. It demands a wiser and a nobler treatment. The whole subject needs to be reviewed by an impartial tribunal, raised above the din and darkness of political conflicts.

The desire and will of the people at large ought to be known. I believe that at this time it is not adequately and truly known. There is widespread discontent in the homes of the people. We are told that the Board School system represents the mind of the people. We believe that it represents only a minority. The Board School system is instruction without religion. The whole people of Ireland would reject it. The great majority of Scotland would reject it. The great majority of the people of England are claimed by the Established Church. They would reject it. Of the Catholics of England and Scotland I need not speak. A multitude of Nonconformists, true to the religious spirit of their forefathers, would reject it.

Who would remain? An active minority which, in a moment of political excitement, carried the Act of 1870. We believe the great majority of the United Kingdom to desire religious and Christian schools. Why are they who say we are wrong in this belief so slow to let it be tested? I must believe that they are not so sure as they say. Let them, then, unite with us in putting it to the test. Let us unite in humbly praying that Her Majesty be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to review the whole course of legislation in respect to education, with all the acts of the Committee of Privy Council since 1838. The evidence to be taken would be that of men of every kind and class, whose life has been spent in acquiring personal experience and a mature judgment in the education of the people. They who desire that the Board School system should cover the face of the land will deprecate a Royal Commission. They who fear so great a disaster to our Christianity and character as Englishmen will earnestly pray for it. They will urge it all the more earnestly, because they believe that there is danger in delay; that every year will spread more widely schools without religion, and starve out the Christian schools of England. It is now or never. The ten years since 1870 have taught us our danger. The next ten years will render impossible what can be done now. In 1882 the Christian schools of England may be placed upon the broad and common foundation of equality before the law. In 1892, if we are slack to-day, the time may be past for ever.

II.

THE WORKING OF THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870 UNEQUAL: THEREFORE UNJUST.

(*Nineteenth Century*, February 1883.)

THE WORKING OF THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870 UNEQUAL: THEREFORE UNJUST.

THE grave and courteous answer of Mr. Dale in the *Nineteenth Century* for January, to what I had written on the Education Act of 1870 in December last, lays upon me the duty of making a reply. In doing so, I hope that nothing will escape from me at variance with his good example.

My object is not contention but agreement: I desire to invite all who value Christianity and education in England to stand firmly together in defence of Christian education, and to press onward steadily for its extension throughout English homes. I rejoice, therefore, to note many points of agreement in Mr. Dale's reply to my argument.

1. We are fully agreed in the desire that the whole population of the country should be duly educated.

2. And that those who are unable, by reason of poverty, to provide education for their children, should be aided by the help of the public revenues.

3. Further, and most emphatically, I agree with him, that to compel Nonconformists of any kind to go to an Anglican school, or to any school where their conscience can be tampered with, is a flagrant injustice.

4. Once more, that education is to be valued and promoted for its own sake, and not, as Mr. Dale puts it, for the sake of "Churches." Though Catholics desire all men to come to the knowledge of the truth, their work of education has their own flocks and their own children so emphatically in view that the presence of non-Catholic children in their schools is wholly unsought, and, if their number be great, it is a cause of difficulty to them.

5. Further, I am rejoiced to perceive in the cautious reserve of Mr. Dale, that he distinguishes between the reading of the Bible and doctrinal Christianity. He denies that they are equivalent in phrase or in fact. This I read with great satisfaction. I would that it were more widely recognised.

6. Lastly, I agree with Mr. Dale in all he says as to the care that is due to the Nonconformists scattered throughout the villages and small towns of the country. I would support with all my heart his pleading for them before any Royal Commission. He takes as an example the parish of Blackford, with a thousand people, of which he claims half as Nonconformists. By his theory in page 62 he would have one only school for the sake of efficiency. I would have two, for the sake both of conscience and of Christianity. To impose one only Anglican school on the five hundred Nonconformists would be unjust. To impose a Board School on the five hundred Anglicans would be equally unjust. I would oppose both schemes as tyrannous; and I would contend for the Christian liberty and Christian conscience of both Nonconformists and

Anglicans. Thoroughly as I value the efficiency of schools, I value the liberty and conscience of Christian men far more. The Nonconformists of Blackford, being five hundred, could have their united school, and in five hundred there would be at least one hundred children: and a school of a hundred children, with proper care, may be made completely efficient. There are cases more difficult than that of Blackford. As you diminish the population, so you increase the difficulty. But it is a still greater difficulty, not where there are thousands or hundreds, but where there are only tens. Such difficulties must always exist. Nobody knows them better than we. There are Catholics scattered in villages and in small towns by tens and by fives, or by single families here and there. We have too much common sense to demand of the majorities, be they Anglicans or Nonconformists, the breaking up not only of their schools, but the sacrifice of their religious conscience, and the change of the legal status of their education to meet our objections. It would be like blowing up a town to clear the rooms of mosquitoes. There must always be residual difficulties which cannot be met by legislation. They must be treated by common sense, justice, and equity. The nearest approach to such a treatment would be what I have laid down: namely, a universal education rate, with proportionate participation, and separate schools for all who are willing to form them under the conditions of the statute: or, again, common schools on like terms for those who prefer them: or, finally, for all those who cannot form or maintain schools of their own,

the amplest conscience clause, vigilantly guarded, and promptly vindicated.

But here begin our disagreements:

1. I cannot think that the million of schoolless children in 1870 represented only poverty in their parents. First, because others equally poor had already founded and maintained their schools—witness the Wesleyans and the Catholics. These children were schoolless because, as I must believe, their parents looked on the education of the people as a matter belonging to the State, or at least not belonging to private persons, either as Christians or as members of the commonwealth. Religion they held to be one thing and education another. They built their chapel and paid their minister, as Mr. Dale says. Having done this, they were content. This I believe to be the chief cause why, outside of the voluntary schools, there was no education in the country. Other causes, indeed, there were, such as vice, neglect, intemperance—all these contributed to the general desolation; but the main cause, I must believe, was apathy, an absence of zeal for education, and of a sense of responsibility to found or to build schools for themselves and for others. This belief is still further confirmed by the fact that the Nonconformists of this country, always excepting the Wesleyans, are to be found chiefly among the middle and lower middle class. But the middle class are above poverty. The population of England and Wales in 1870 was about 22,000,000. The Established Church had provided school room for 1,765,944: that is, taking a sixth for the children who

ought to be at school, for about 10,000,000 people. The Nonconformists had at that time school room for 411,948: that is, by the same calculation, they had provided for about 2,500,000 people. It is clear, then, either that the Nonconformist population was greatly less than that of the Established Church, or that the Nonconformists were behindhand in the work of providing schools for their children. And this may be gathered from Mr. Dale's plea of poverty. They could not provide schools, he says. Therefore it is not unreasonable to believe that they did not; and from this it follows that they who were chiefly responsible for the destitution complained of have now received the chief benefit and control of the Act of 1870 and of the education rates.

2. I must also disagree in Mr. Dale's statement that the Board Schools represent the kind of religious teaching desired by the people of this country.

First, because the people of this country as yet know little of what the religious teaching of the Board Schools may be. "They are attached to the Board Schools," as Mr. Dale says, "because they are larger, handsomer, better lighted, better warmed, more attractive than their own schools." There is nothing of religion in all this. The people may be indifferent, or careless, or thoughtless about the religious teaching. But that is a long way from approving positively or knowingly of the religion taught in the Board Schools.

Further, if the people of this country had any zeal for the Act of 1870, or any care to promote its operation, they would go to the poll at the triennial

elections. But the fact now comes out, that of the electors a very large proportion never vote at all. In the metropolitan district, for instance, at the last election not one in four had zeal or care enough in the matter to go to the poll. There were weeks of placarding and addressing and canvassing in public meetings, and by private agents, but not one in four voted. In each of the metropolitan boroughs about three-fourths, or even more, did not take the trouble to vote at all. This is a new revelation. Hitherto it has been thought and, because much vaunted, believed that the Act of 1870 was an Act demanded by the popular voice, and that it represents the popular mind. I agree with Mr. Dale in thinking that it was an Act carried by a Liberation Parliament, which began with the schools on its way to the Established Church.

It was so far a political measure. It disendowed religion in the schools as an approach to disendow religion in the Established Chuch. But, as I have said, the disendowment of religion is the endowment of secularism.

3. Here, again, is another point of disagreement. Mr. Dale thinks that I contradict myself because I have said that the Board Schools are secular schools, and also that the reading of the Bible in them has given them a religious character. These two things are perfectly consistent. There is no contradiction. At the outset the Bible was not read in them. The schools then were essentially secular. The desire of the people has forced the reading of the Bible into them, and now they have a religious semblance. This fact proves that whereas the schools are essentially

secular, the people have made them so far religious. I quoted this fact, not to commend the Board Schools, but to prove that the desire of the people of this country is decisively in favour of religious education.

4. Once more, I fear, I must disagree where I most wish to agree with Mr. Dale. He affirms broadly that doctrinal Christianity may be taught, and is taught, in the Board Schools: and that not in contravention of the Act of 1870, but in conformity with it. He points out that the clause of the Act excludes only "formularies and catechisms distinctive of any denomination." If I rightly understand him, he says that this does not exclude the matter of such formularies, but only the formularies themselves. He says, indeed, that Christian doctrines may be taught, and are taught, by Nonconformists without creeds or formularies. If I had so interpreted the Act of 1870, I am afraid—"pace Sancti Ignatii"—that I should have been called a Jesuit. But if the Act of 1870 permits Nonconformist schoolmasters to teach in Board Schools the doctrines which Nonconformist ministers, without creeds or formularies, teach in chapels, what becomes of Clause 14? Are not these doctrines distinctive of any denominations? But they are taught without creeds or formularies. Yes, but doctrines are the mental conceptions of which creeds are only the verbal expression. Creeds are only the diagrams of the triangles, as I said. But Mr. Dale tells us that Nonconformists do not use creeds or formularies. Then Board Schools are after all Nonconformist and denominational. They are the endowment of the Nonconformist religion. I am

not arguing to exclude the Nonconformist religion or Christianity, so far as it is true, from the Board Schools. I thank God that so much of Christianity yet remains in the schools of the Act of 1870, and that the will of the people is forcing the Christianity of England, whatsoever it be, into the Board Schools and through the clauses of the Act of 1870. This is to me clear gain, but it enormously strengthens my argument as to the inequality and injustice of the Act in its present application. For it results in this. The Anglican, the Catholic, and the Wesleyan schools are aided by the Privy Council grants only, and that for maintenance alone, and not for the multiplication, of schools. The Nonconformist doctrines are aided by Privy Council grants, and are exclusively endowed with the whole education rate, both for maintenance and for indefinite multiplication of Board Schools. Indeed, Mr. Dale says that the friends of the Act of 1870 foresaw and desired that Board Schools should "displace" all others. This is the issue at stake: honestly avowed.

And here I must call attention to the incongruities of this Biblical instruction. The Bible may be read and explained, and explained doctrinally, but only in such words as the schoolmaster may select. The weighed and exact words of formularies and catechisms, which the highest and best minds have for ages pondered and fixed as the most adequate and exact expression of truth, are not statutable, but the extemporaneous or haphazard words of the schoolmaster are sanctioned by the Act of 1870. Surely this is a surpassing perversity. Let us go a step further: the

schoolmaster may explain the Bible in the sense of doctrinal Christianity. But does the schoolmaster belong to no denomination? And does he so know the peculiarities of all denominations that he can teach a doctrinal Christianity which shall not coincide with any one of them? This unsectarian doctrinal Christianity should at once be stereotyped for the use of Board Schools. It is an achievement, or even a miracle, of Biblical exegesis. But if, to exclude errors, variations, and contradictions, it were stereotyped and imposed on all Board Schools, it would straightway become formulary. Mr. Dale says that the doctrines of our Lord's divinity, His atonement for the sins of man, the future judgment, may be taught without formularies in Board Schools. Are not these distinctive? But this is not all. If the people of England could be assured of the Biblical teaching of the schoolmasters in 1883, this would be no security for 1884. The schoolmasters, like other men, may change their minds. Lady Hewley's Charity is warning enough. The law has been changed to meet the lapse of endowments from Orthodoxy to Heterodoxy, from Trinitarianism to Unitarianism. A prescription of twenty years is enough, I believe, for any error in possession. Schoolmasters may begin to the satisfaction of Mr. Dale, but may end to the satisfaction of the Agnostics. Not only may schoolmasters change their minds, but schoolmasters may be changed themselves. They are here to-day and there to-morrow. And will the incoming doctrine agree with the outgoing? And the poor children of Christian parents, and the poor

parents of Christian children, are to be tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine as schoolmasters and School Boards please. I do not know the English people if they will not one day rise up in anger against this trifling with all that is most precious to the poor, to their children, and to their conscience. Nine Conscience Clauses will not be enough to protect them from this creedless Christianity. The next work for the Liberation Society ought to be to disestablish and disendow the Board Schools.

There is, however, a still more preposterous result. With all their imperfections, the ministers of religion are supposed to be qualified to teach by study, training, experience; and they teach with a sense of responsibility. They have been as much set apart to teach religion as schoolmasters are set apart to teach secular knowledge. But no minister is admitted to teach in a Board School. Of whatsoever colour he be, a minister is distinctive of a denomination. The schoolmaster is without colour or creed. No denomination owns him, nor he any. He is by the statute an unsectarian unattached. All trained ministers are excluded—only untrained schoolmasters may teach doctrinal Christianity by law. This exclusion of "the fittest," and the survival of the less fit, throws the religious teaching of our rising youths into the hands of the unfit. Could unreason more visibly betray itself? And can any considerate man wonder that all who hold dear as life the faith once delivered to the Saints in all its integrity and in all its precision conscientiously refuse to send their children to Board Schools? And these schools

are one day to "isolate" and to "displace" the Voluntary and Christian schools of England. If Mr. Dale's account be accurate, the net result of all this would be that the Board School system has been turned into the endowment of a new religion. It is a Pan-Nonconformist Church concurrently endowed side by side with the Established Church.

I must also take leave to call this new form of Christianity emphatically sectarian; and the system itself, a new sect of which schoolmasters are the pontiffs. It is also a propaganda of Christianity without a creed. And the first effect of it will be to break down in the minds of the English people the surviving belief that Christianity is a fixed and definite truth. As yet, I do not believe that it represents the religion with which the people are content, but in ten years more I can well believe that they will not only be content with the dispensation of schoolmasters, but with less. The managers of the 302 Church schools and the 176 Non-conformist schools already surrendered to the School Boards are content, it seems, with the shadow of their Christian inheritance.

5. Once more I must disagree in the statement that the Act of 1870 has done great things for the Voluntary schools. Mr. Dale says that by its committees, &c., it has enabled them "to increase the number of their schools, and the number of children in average attendance; that the grant earned has been greatly increased, and the number of the children nearly doubled." All this he sets down to the Act of 1870. I set down none of it. All might and ought to have

been done without it. If he had set it down to the movement that produced the Act itself, I should agree with him. The facts are these. The destitute condition of so large a number of children, the inadequacy of the efforts, great as they had been, of the founders of Voluntary schools, the niggardly parsimony of the annual vote for education of 600,000*l.* a year, with an irresistible impulse and a growing conviction throughout the country that we were behindhand in education —these and other like causes produced the Act of 1870. As soon as it became law the Committee of Privy Council gave notice that after two years all grants in aid of building new schools would cease. This was, in fact, a declaration against the multiplication of Voluntary schools. And this at once roused the friends of religious education to a great effort. In the ten years from 1870 to 1880 the increase of schools and scholars was as follows:

In 1869-70 there was school room for 1,765,944. In 1879-80, for 3,158,119; increase, 1,392,175. Average attendance in 1869-70, 1,062,999; in 1879-80, 1,981,684; increase, 918,685. Even Catholics out of their poverty raised a "Crisis Fund"—so called because of the perils of the Act of 1870—with this result: they raised 390,000*l.*, and provided school room for 71,518 additional children. There is no communion in England poorer than the Catholic Church. A few old and wealthy families there are, with a handful of the middle class and a million of labouring poor. What the Catholics and Wesleyans did, the Nonconformists might have done, and more abundantly.

Not a particle of this vast increase came directly from the Act of 1870. It did, indeed, give a menace and an alarm, followed by the refusal of building grants. All the machinery of committees and bye-laws, and boy-beadles and school "visitors," might have been created without the Act of 1870 or the Board School system. Machinery is an accident which might have been created without the Act as it stands. All the 1,570,000*l.* which Mr. Dale says the Voluntary schools have earned has been earned since 1870, as before it, not by the Act or because of the Act, but under the minutes and inspection of the Committee of Privy Council. I must deny altogether that we owe to the Act of 1870 as such anything but alarm, and the energy which alarm excites. For this I thank it; but for nothing more. We owe to it much privation, the loss of the building grants, the legal secularisation of our schools, and the exclusion of Christianity from our school hours and from our school books. To the Nonconformist schools and to those who had not denied themselves to provide schools, the Act was, indeed, a profuse and an exclusive boon. To those who had laboured and toiled, spending and being spent for the education of England, it was, as one of its chief promoters was compelled to confess in Parliament, great discouragement to Voluntary schools.

6. Again, I fear, I must accept Mr. Dale's disagreement by affirming once more that the statute of 1870 has reduced our schools to the condition of secular schools. During the four hours of the school day only secular matter can be taught. What is taught

out of those hours is beyond the law, and, morally, as much out of the school as if it were taught under another roof. And as I said, it is taught *freely*: that is, so far as the Government is concerned, which pays nothing for it, and takes no cognisance of it—not freely, indeed, for the managers who bear the burden in the maintenance of the school, and in the teachers' stipend. Mr. Dale's comment, that if our schools are only secular, Government may dispense with them, is hardly well weighed. Government is bound by every bond of equity and justice to recognise freedom of conscience; and if the Voluntary schools of England were "displaced," such a violation of conscience would be perpetrated as would convict all the agents, aiders, abettors, and comforters of such a policy of tyranny and simulation: of tyranny, in violating conscience; of simulation, in prating about religious liberty. Here is the inevitable alternative: the Legislature must either recognise liberty of conscience, and the schools freely founded on liberty of conscience; or, with the profession of civil and religious liberty in its mouth, it must force secular education upon a Christian people. Free denominational schools are the safeguards and depositories, the outworks and bulwarks, of liberty of conscience. The world has gone right round the compass. If the Free Churches of England should in the nineteenth century make reprisals on the Court of High Commission and the Star Chamber in the seventeenth century, they would take away the liberty of conscience for which their fathers suffered all pain and loss, and make their name a perpetual reproach. The

Voluntary or Christian schools give to the Government at an inadequate price a full secular teaching. This is all it requires and all it recognises. To the Christian teaching of the school the Government contributes nothing, and has no pretext or plea to interfere. Nay, more, it cannot interfere without a violation of the liberty of Englishman to believe and to educate their children as their conscience dictates.

7. Again, I am unable to agree with Mr. Dale that in a population of 1500, howsoever divided in religion, there ought to be only one school, because small schools of sixty or seventy children are not efficient. Here we reach the truth. It is secular efficiency against religion and conscience. I would maintain that, whether the population be 15,000 or 1500, Anglicans, Catholics, and Nonconformists ought to be free to found their own schools, and ought to be aided by the public revenues to do so. If in such a population any desire and are willing to deny themselves to found a secular school, I would at once say that in our mixed state they ought to be helped by public aid to do so. As to efficiency, the Government by its inspectors will take care. In three places Mr. Dale says that Nonconformists are "unable," "are too poor," and "cannot" found schools for themselves. To this I answer again, the Wesleyans and Catholics of England out of their greater poverty have done so, and for the religious care of their children hold themselves bound to do so. Let others do the same. I cannot, therefore, accept the plea of inability, except in cases where the numbers are few and scattered. And these cases may be treated

exceptionally. The rule is founded on a great law of equal justice, and it ought not to be abandoned because of a few residual difficulties.

8. I am sorry to add to the list of disagreements, but two remain which I cannot pass over. Mr. Dale asks, What will become of the "moral power of the Voluntary system which no public money can create," "the unbought energy," "the free gift," if the Voluntary schools receive a share in the school rates? Voluntaryism would then cease to be. Not so fast; I will tell him. I would give to the Board Schools a share in the school rate in proportion to the voluntary contributions of those who desire to found such schools. This would at once spread the wholesome principle of voluntaryism all over the land. I would have no educational pauperism; and I would give to the Voluntary schools, in like manner, though not, perhaps, in like proportion, a share in the education rate. The effect of this measure would be universal equality, and therefore universal justice. The schools of the whole country would depend on four kinds of support: the Consolidated Fund, the school rate, the contributions of founders and managers, the school-pence paid by the parents. I have said that the proportion might vary. For denominational schools it may be equitable to require that the contributions should be larger, and the school rate less, than in the Board Schools. Mr. Dale says that most people would prefer schools managed by boards. Let them have them. But more, I believe, would prefer their own management and their own schools. All who pay ought to share; no school

ought to exist without voluntary contributions as well as State aid. Under the old Poor Law the people were pauperised, and the rates were intolerable because all was done by the rate, and little was required of the receiver. The amendment of the Poor Law revived profitable labour, and restricted relief to helpless poverty. This combination of popular energy with public aid runs through all the healthiest and most vigorous activities of our commonwealth. It is being destroyed by the working of the Act of 1870. Mr. Dale desires the displacement of "Voluntary schools by Board Schools." He says: "the Board School system is certain to supersede the schools of the denominationalists" (p. 70). Here again we agree. He thinks it will be for good. I believe it will be a fatal and final evil. Time was when some would have agreed with me. "Our object," said Mr. Forster in 1870, "is to complete the present Voluntary system, to fill up gaps, sparing the public money where it can be done without, procuring as much as we can the assistance of the parents, and welcoming as much as we rightly can the co-operation and aid of those benevolent men who desire to assist their neighbours."[1] Mr. Dale's system of universal Board Schools would abolish all Voluntary schools, and convert all voluntary contributions into school rates. Where would Voluntaryism be then? Education would be endowed as by tithes and Church rates, levied on the willing and unwilling alike. My desire would be to lighten the rates as much as possible, and to develop as much

[1] *Hansard*, vol. cxcix. p. 443.

as possible the energy, generosity, zeal, self-respect, self-help of the people of England. Rate schools will kill all these highest qualities of a free people, and burden us with a mechanical, automatous, educational bureaucracy worked from a centre with clouds of paid officials. Germany and France are examples which no Christian Englishman — I will say which no free Englishman — will desire to follow. There is only one adequate check to this tendency, and that is that conscience shall be free, and that the choice of education shall be free throughout the whole people. Mr. Dale thinks that he has a larger faith in English Christianity than I have. I doubt it: as I will show before I have done. But I think I have a larger faith in free and voluntary education than he has. Before 1870, with the annual pittance of 600,000*l.* a year, the people of England were hardly encouraged to spontaneous effort, and yet they founded schools for nearly two million of children. Show them now that to honest effort on their part help sufficient for their need is offered, and the hands that hang down will be lifted to resolute work. But this will never be so long as the Act of 1870 is unequally and unjustly worked for the exclusive creation of schools for which no voluntary effort is demanded.

9. I will close this array of disagreements by one more, which is, I fear, very deep. Mr. Dale says: "I have a larger faith than the Cardinal in the prospects of English Christianity. It is not dependent upon the success of his Eminence in getting a million a year from the rates for the support of denominational schools. Let the secular education of the people be provided by

secular authorities, and let the Churches, by whatever arrangements seem expedient to them, provide for religious education at their own cost, and out of school hours" (p. 75). I have already shown that we do provide religious instruction outside of the four school hours and without the State or public revenues, partly by the stipends paid to our teachers, and by the free personal work of our clergy. Therefore, in what I add I have this always before me.

It is now fifty years since I began to work among the poor; and I think I know their state. The home ought to be the best school, but it is not so. A Christian people can only be perpetuated by Christian education; but Christian education is not to be given in the unaided homes of England—no, not even of the rich, or of the middle class, or of the poor. Where one home is full of Christian truth, a thousand are unable, by reason of toil or incapacity, to teach the children of the house. Christian education is to be perpetuated in England by Christian schools. It was Christian schools that made England; and it will be in the schools, Christian or deprived of Christianity, as it may be, that the future of England will be decided. Schools without Christianity will rear a people without Christianity. It is true that neither a million, nor a myriad of millions of money, will perpetuate Christianity. It will be sustained, as it was first diffused, by teaching, and by teaching all that the Divine Author of Christianity commanded us to believe and to do. Direct and certain evidence convinces me that the last ten years of the Act of 1870 have already done much to

weaken the power of Christianity over the schools of this country. How can it be otherwise? Before 1870 the whole school day was pervaded by Christian faith. Every book presupposed its truth; in many it was explicitly recognised. It is not so now. I am aware that five hours a week of religious teaching, if well used, may do much, and if zealously employed may do enough at least for individuals. But who that knows the irregularity of attendance, the want of punctuality in the morning, the weariness and the wandering of children in the afternoon, can fail to see that Christianity is put to every disadvantage, and embarrassed by every discouraging circumstance? Who that knows the unequal, imperfect, and perfunctory working of any extensive system depending upon human agency can fail to know how, with all effort to tend upward, we are continually tending downward? I am a firm and fearless believer in the future of Christianity in England. Nothing but extermination of Christians and Christian teachers can extinguish it. But I have little confidence in doctrinal Christianity without creeds. The history of latitudinarianism since 1688, of free-thinking since 1700, and of rationalism since 1840, is before us. The history of Presbyterianism, as in Lady Hewley's Charity, and of other forms of religious thought, is also known. If the religious teaching of the Board Schools be all that the people of England desire, as Mr. Dale says, then I need not add more proof that Christianity is already far in its decline. I am not insensible of the widespread and wonderful reviving of religion in individuals: but what is the

state of the masses of the people? Thirty years of work and observation in London have taught me things that Mr. Dale cannot efface from my reason. The late Hugh James Rose, whose name is venerated in Cambridge and by many still surviving, if it be unknown to the younger men of this day, drew out with his wide knowledge of German literature the decline of Christianity in Germany. He traced its three periods—the first of rigorous dogma, from which men recoiled into a second stage of devout, indefinite pietism; which again issued in a third, the rationalistic rejection both of dogma and of pietism, and the reign of unbelief. I hope I may be deceived, but I believe that England passed from its dogmatic religion in the last century into its pietism in the time of Wesley, and that it is passing into its final period of rationalism and positivism in the educated, and of naturalism and materialism in the uneducated, classes. This downward tide no Board School education and no creedless Christianity can arrest. It is because I have a large faith in Christianity that I have no faith in education which deviates from the inheritance of Christian England. The schools of England were pervaded with Christianity down to the year 1870; their action may have been feeble upon the masses, and must have been feeble if the religion taught by schoolmasters in Board Schools is all that they desire. I do not believe it; I have better hopes, and a large confidence, and I do not speak without experience. The clergy and people of the Anglican Church will judge between me and Mr. Dale. Nay, many among the Nonconformists with whom I have

had correspondence will also be able to decide between us. A million of money will not touch the heart of the English people. I need no one to tell me that; and the phrase has a hollow sound. But the multiplication of Christian schools will touch and train both heart and will to the truth and life of our Divine Master. This is now at stake, and I impeach the unequal and unjust application or misapplication of the Act of 1870 as the peril which is impending over Christian England. Some men think that what was long ago has never been, and what is now far off will never come. But in my belief it is not more certain that two converging lines will intersect, though it be beyond the horizon, than that the steady elimination of Christianity from the schools of the people will rob England in the future of its Christian inheritance.

Though I would say much more, I must make an end. And my last word shall be the satisfaction with which I find that, in the midst of so many and irreconcilable disagreements, Mr. Dale agrees fully with me in the main point of my contention. I affirmed that the Board Schools would in the end crush or starve the Voluntary schools. Mr. Dale says: "I think the [School Board] system is certain to supersede the schools of the Denominationalists" (p. 70). My contention, therefore, is not only admitted but supported by the whole weight of Mr. Dale's reasons as well as by my own.

What will be the result of this upon the Christian education, the national character, and the Christianity of England, I leave for the present to the conscience and to the common sense of Englishmen.

III.

IS THE CHRISTIANITY OF ENGLAND WORTH PRESERVING?

(*Nineteenth Century*, April 1883.)

IS THE CHRISTIANITY OF ENGLAND WORTH PRESERVING?

THE rejoinder of Mr. Dale in the last number of this Review does not seem to me to answer my contention, (1) that the working of the Education Act of 1870 is unequal, and therefore unjust; (2) that this injustice ought to be redressed; (3) that all who pay the school rate ought to share in it; (4) that all who share the rate ought to obtain the aid of the State by voluntary efforts; and (5) that for the residual cases of absolute poverty the Government of the country must make adequate provision out of the public funds. Mr. Dale has not, in my judgment, shaken any one of these propositions. This is, however, no personal contention. It is the most vital of our national interests. It must not be narrowed to any personality. What duels are when armies are in the field, personal controversies are in a conflict which affects the welfare and the Christianity of the English people. It is enough that he and I are agreed that the Board School system will, in the end, displace our voluntary and Christian schools. I have affirmed that this will undermine the Christianity and the national character of our people. This affirmation I now take up, and to this subject I confine myself.

Until the Act of 1870 was passed, the schools of England were Christian. By the Act of 1870 the Christian education of England has been launched upon an inclined plane. Its steady future descent, unless promptly and adequately checked, is certain. In the present paper I will endeavour to confirm this assertion by facts at this day before our eyes, that is, by the examples of the United States and of France. We will then review our advance in England.

1. In the *North American Review* for December 1880 is to be found a very thoughtful article by Mr. Richard Grant White, entitled "The Public School Failure." The author gives the history of its origin and development. The system began in New England. In Massachusetts in 1647, and in Connecticut three years later, it was enacted that every township of fifty householders should appoint a person to teach all children who should resort to him to read and write. He was to be paid by the parents or masters, or by the inhabitants in general. In every township of a hundred families there was to be a grammar school to fit youths for the University. This system of compulsory support of common and grammar schools spread all over New England. It spread also partially into the Northern and Western States.

In 1812 the Common School Act was passed for the State of New York. This law applied to towns and villages, but not, with two or three exceptions, to chartered cities. In the City of New York public education was in the hands of the "Public School Society," a voluntary and chartered association. In

1807 an Act was passed for its benefit, of which the following is the preamble:

"Whereas the trustees of the Society for establishing a free school in the City of New York, for the education of such poor children as do not belong to, or are not provided for by, any religious society, have by their memorial solicited the aid of the Legislature—therefore, &c."

The purpose of this Act was to provide education for poor children not provided for by any religious society. In the year 1842 an Act was passed extending to the City of New York the public school system already existing since 1812 in the State of New York. But the Act did more than this. It created a Board of Education, and it placed the Public School Society, the Orphan Asylum, the Catholic Orphan Asylum, and other like societies, which were all voluntary, under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Board. The first effect of this is thus described by Mr. White: "Finding themselves in this position, the corporators of the Public School Society transferred their school-houses and all their other property with their rights to the Board of Education, and *the society ceased to exist.*" Other societies before long followed this example. "This event was a public calamity not only to the City of New York, but to the State; not only to the State, but to the whole country. Nor has the blight of its effect upon morals, upon politics, and upon education been confined to the country in which it was first felt." "*From that time public education passed rapidly into municipal politics,* and became an engine at once of political corruption and social deterioration."

The author then goes on to give the evidence of

inspectors and others as to the inefficiency of the normal schools, of the teachers, and of the pupils. But this I dismiss, as it may be said that the efficiency of teachers and schools is within our power to control.

But a far graver allegation follows, which I will give in his own words.

He begins by quoting the words of the Superintendent of the Board of Education at New York in the Report for 1879, which are as follows:

"In our day, and in the condition of American life, we need all the power of an educated intelligence in order to lift the masses, as well as to maintain an equilibrium in the forces of society. The distribution of knowledge is as necessary as the distribution of light. We need the distributive power of systems of education which will reach the lowest abodes, and penetrate to the farthermost hamlets of the land. The best education of the people will then become the best government of the people."

This fascinating doctrine Mr. White rightly affirms to be unsound and utterly false. He says:

"Knowledge will not lift the masses except as a balloon is lifted, because it is inflated with gas. Mere knowledge does not raise the quality of men's moral natures. . . . The light of a thousand suns will not sustain life without the genial warmth of one."

He then continues:

"If ignorance were the mother of vice, and if our public-school system were what it is set up to be, the fruits of the latter would by this time have been manifest, plainly visible to the whole world, in our moral advancement as a people, in a higher tone in our society, in the greater purity of our politics, and the incorruptibility of our legislators, in the increased probity of the executive officers of our State and Municipal Governments, and of our corporate financial bodies, in the superior wisdom and more solid integrity of our bench, in the sobriety of our matrons, the modesty of our maidens, in the greater faithfulness of wives, in the diminution of divorces, in the steady decrease of

vice and crime and idleness, and vagrancy and vagabondage. . . . [After fifty years of common schooling] our large towns swarm with idle vicious lads and young men who have no visible means of support. Our rural districts are infested with tramps—a creature unknown to our fathers, and even to us in our youth."

I am afraid of going on. Mr. White adds:

"The corruption of legislative bodies, open bribery at elections, a notable decline in the character of the bench, dishonesty in business, betrayal of trust so common as to escape shame, politics becoming a trade, and falling year by year into lower hands. Divorces have multiplied until they have become a stock jest in the facetious column of our newspapers. Crime and vice have increased year after year, almost *pari passu* with the development of the public-school system. . . . Filial respect and parental love have both diminished. . . . This is the condition in which we are after more than half a century of experience of our public-school systems."

Mr. White says truly: "Do not tell me that this would have been even without it. Your only justification for the system was that by it all this would be prevented."

I should not venture to quote these statements from any but an American hand; nor would I quote them from any periodical of less established authority and weight than the *North American Review*.

Our next American witness will be the editor of a periodical published in California under the title of the *Family's Defender*. Its object is to protect the rights of parents and the domestic life of the people. In an article of close argument the editor says:

"A candidate for governor who to-day ventured before the people on a platform of 'Christian Education for Christian Children' would be hopelessly beaten at the polls, the majority of voters who cast their ballots against him being themselves *professed Christians*, but *brought up in the negative and essentially pagan atmosphere of the public schools*. . . . According to this system

every child is entitled to be educated at the public expense, and every parent is bound to send his children to the public schools. . . . Under this system it is not the parent, but the general public through its elected school directors, that select and dismiss the teachers, that rebuild and repair school-houses, &c. The general public, and not the parent of the child, have the authority to determine, in all cases of alleged sickness or other ailment, whether the child has sufficient reason to absent itself from school. . . . to determine the course of study, the kind of companions with whom it shall associate, and what particular books the child shall study. And for his conduct the teacher is answerable, not to the parents of his pupils, but to the public-school officials."

This system, the editor contends, "is essentially and intrinsically wrong;" it is "a palpable and perpetual violation of the moral law."

There are, the author goes on to say, three particulars in which this system is intrinsically unjust, and therefore intrinsically and essentially bad, apart from all religious arguments.

First, it is unjust to the taxpayer, who is forced to pay for the education of children whose parents can and ought to pay for the education of their offspring. Every parent is as much bound by the law of nature to educate his children as he is bound to feed and clothe them.

Secondly, it is unjust to parents. By the law of nature fathers and mothers have by right the guardianship of their own children. Parents have the right to control the education of their children. They are bound to select such schools and instructors as they believe to be safest and best for their children. They are bound also in duty to watch over the associations of their children, and to control them with entire independence.

The Common School system violates all these rights, and obstructs all these duties. Parental authority is defeated, and filial affection and obedience are thereby diminished and destroyed. "The relaxation of parental authority has always been found one of the surest indications of the decline of social order, and the unfailing precursor of public turbulence and anarchy."

Thirdly, this system is unjust to the children. It strikes at their most vital and sacred rights. The Common School system withdraws the child from the influences which the law of nature has provided for its moral training and formation; and it substitutes, and can substitute, nothing in the place of the parental conscience, responsibility, love, and interest in the welfare and moral formation of the child. Children have a natural right to be trained and formed by the moral law. Schools without religion cannot give this formation; for morals are the relations between God and man, and between man and man. And these relations cannot be taught without teaching at least the religion of nature, and a knowledge of the Divine Lawgiver to Whom we must give account. This the State refuses to teach, and yet it withdraws the child from the control of the parent, thereby making it impossible for the parent to confide the child to teachers of his own choice. "If God has made parents to prize the honour, the moral purity, the spotless virtue of their children to such a degree that no greater earthly calamity could befall them than its degradation and moral ruin, was it not in order that through parental vigilance and guardianship the child might be pro-

tected from the contamination and touch of vice?" The law of nature has invested parents with these responsibilities. Nature knows nothing of "school directors." But the Common School system robs the children of this parental guardianship, and commits them by compulsion to the school directors, the representatives of the "general public."

The editor sums up his case as follows:

"First, we ask of every taxpayer that he assist us in the work of exonerating himself from the unjust burden of paying for the education of children—not his own—whose parents are abundantly able to pay for their education. Secondly, we ask every father and mother . . . to assert and maintain the true dignity and authority of the parental office. We ask that they, and not somebody else, be allowed to determine for their children who shall be their teachers, and who their companions."

I am obliged most reluctantly to omit much that is of great force and value in this remarkable impeachment. I can only add the words of the Bishop of St. Paul, Minnesota, in a letter of the 3rd of October 1882. He says to the writer of the article here quoted:

"If you need any words of mine to encourage you in the course you are pursuing, you have them from my heart. Every day convinces me more and more that the ground you have taken in defence of the rights of a family against the encroachments of the State is really the ground upon which the opposition to the State school system should have been based from the beginning. Natural rights as involved in this question no legitimate Government will infringe or allow to be infringed upon due proof. The law of majorities, the *vox populi*, has no weight against the claims of natural family rights."

Such is the Common School system in the American Republic, over which as yet the Platonic and communistic theory that the children of a State belong not

to their parents but to the State has never yet exerted its malignant spell. The American commonwealth has in it too much of English and Puritan blood, its vital relation to our seventeenth century is too vivid and powerful, to endure the theory that the children belong to "the general public," and that the State may create them to its own image and likeness. Nevertheless, in its zeal for education it has admitted the false principles which legitimately lead to this conclusion. Education that is only *secular* dooms religion to gradual extinction. Education that is *common* violates conscience. Education that is *secular*, *common*, and *compulsory* violates the rights both of parents and of children. Logically, on these principles the schools are schools of the State, the children are the children of the State, and their formation is at the will of the State against all rights, parental or divine. As yet these syllogisms are dormant beyond the Atlantic. They are awake and in pride of place beyond the British Channel. And to this we will turn next.

II. Most opportunely at this crisis of religious education in England, M. Jules Simon has published an account of the state of education in France. The parallel is so exact that all who desire to preserve our Christianity as a people ought to read and lay it to heart. I can only give a very brief and rapid summary of it.

In 1808 the Imperial University of France was founded. M. Simon calls it "une sorte d'église laïque," a kind of lay Church.[1] The whole education

[1] *Dieu, Patrie et Liberté*, p. 115.

of the French people was centralised in this omnipresent and omnipotent authority. No man could teach without holding its faculties.[2] From that day to this the liberty to found schools and to teach has existed only twice, and for a brief moment. It was granted by the Republic in 1848 and by the Assembly in 1871. Since then the Imperial revolutionary system has revived in its supreme power. The Bishops in 1809-10 formed colleges for youths destined for the priesthood; the fathers of families, to save their sons from a Voltairean education, sent them to these colleges. A decree of 1811 at once subjected them in all things to the control of the University. In 1814 and 1815 religious education became once more possible, and it was energetically restored. The Revolution of 1830 placed once more in the hands of the philosophers what M. Simon calls "the great instrument of intellectual servitude."[3] They revived the University in all its omnipotence. It passionately vindicated its monopoly to teach. The professors and licensed teachers of the University were of all religions and of no religion. Then came the Revolution of 1848. The first act of the Assemblée Constituante was "to inscribe the name of God at the head of the Constitution." Liberty to teach was proclaimed as a right of nature, of which no citizen without injustice could be deprived, except for moral and personal unworthiness, judicially proved. After the law of 1850 free schools were multiplied and State schools diminished in number. The Second Empire instinctively

[2] *Dieu, Patrie et Liberté*, p. 120, note. [3] Ibid. p. 136.

returned to the ways of the First; nevertheless it permitted much liberty of teaching, and it diminished the majesty of the University by creating colleges in the departments depending upon the *préfets*. The number of professors was increased, their salaries augmented. It respected the liberty to teach in primary schools which had existed since 1833, and in secondary schools granted in 1850. But the hand of the State was upon all. M. Simon says that the Second Empire was despotic over the liberty of the press, but favourable to the liberty of teaching. He goes on to say that the Assembly of 1871 took up the tradition of the Assembly of 1848. Liberty of instruction and liberty of religious teaching were completely restored. From this date begins the conflict and the crisis to which I would call attention. The last twelve years have been an incessant assault of the so-called Liberal party against what was called Clericalism and the Sacristy; that is to say, in plain English, Christianity in politics and in education. The Assembly, nominally Republican, contained within itself every shade of difference, from reactionary Monarchists to Red Republicans. The amnesty of the Communards registered its degree of red heat.

On the 4th of September 1874, and on a motion to permit the free foundation of universities, M. Challemel-Lacour sounded the first note in a speech of extreme frankness. He began by saying, "I will tell you that for my part I do not believe in that liberty," *i.e.* of instruction. "That question involves the highest interest, not only of the intellectual honour of our country, but even of *the moral unity of France*."

M. Simon says that at these words there "was great applause from the Left, for these words have a vast reach, and give the programme of the campaign afterwards opened by M. Gambetta and executed by M. Ferry." M. Simon adds: "To accomplish the moral unity of France, to hinder all who would interfere with the moral unity of France, all this either means nothing, or it means the religion of the State. All the difference between the ancient religion of the State and the new is, that the name of the old religion is Christianity and the name of the new is Nihilism." In a word, M. Challemel-Lacour foresaw that these new universities would be explicitly and energetically religious, or, as he said, "philosophical." He defined this as "an obscure region which envelops that which is certain in science," and as "a domain delivered over to conjecture and the supernatural." This is a peril to the "intellectual honour" of France. And for the "moral unity" such universities "would every day multiply a race believing in one faith, one God, one Baptism,"[4] which would interfere with the moral unity of France—that is, "the unity of unbelief, the unity of positivism, the unity of independent morality." This moral unity has not yet been made in France, but it is rapidly making. It is the inevitable end, and the deliberate intention of those who at this hour sway the destinies, or rather are swayed by the lurchings, of that once great Christian people.

The next advance in this assault was made by M. Jules Ferry. In a Bill to amend the Act of 1875, he

[4] *Dieu, Patrie et Liberté*, pp. 178-9, 182-3.

introduced the now famous Article 7, which took away the liberty to teach from all members of congregations or bodies not authorised by the State. This struck at once between 7000 and 8000 persons, the great majority of the best instructors engaged in teaching the French people. When Article 7 had been rejected, came the decrees of March 1880. These took away the liberty to teach from fourteen thousand of the best educators of the women of France. They broke up numberless orphanages and works of charity.

We are not now concerned with the general anti-religious policy of the party at this time in power. It is enough to enumerate the series of attempts or acts which in the last two years have followed so rapidly. The abolition of chaplains for the army, of the judicial oath, of the emblems of religion in schools, the enlistment of ecclesiastics, the attack upon the grants for public worship, upon the Concordat, upon the civil condition of the clergy—all these are but signs of one and the same deliberate and downward movement, destroying every remnant of the ancient Christianity of the French people. Over all this we must now pass. We will come at once to the last words of this atrocious policy. They are *Laïcisation* and *Ecole Neutre*. The French language lends itself with a singular promptness to the irony of cynics. Our tongue is slow and cumbrous. The nearest approach is the word *Sectarian* to describe the schools of Christendom. Laicisation is clear enough. To laicise a school is to put out priest, brother, minister, and rabbi, and put in a layman. The University is, as M. Simon says, an *Eglise*

laïque, a lay Church. And the schools of the State must be lay, for the State is the lay society of the world, and the clergy belong to the sacristy. M. Ferry does not ask which are the better teachers. The instructors of the people must be laymen. There is an intensity of tyrannical malevolence in this: above all in France, where the great majority of the people still believe in Christianity. But the other phrase is less explicit. The neutral school is not one in which Catholic and Protestant may learn the alphabet together, nor where Christian and Jew may meet, nor where Christian and Deist may sit side by side. It is a school in which there is neutrality as to the existence of God, and therefore the State prohibits the pronouncing of His Name.

In 1882 a president of the schools, in making his official visit, said to the children, "People pretend that we wish to have schools without God. But you cannot turn a page of your books without finding there the name of a god, that is, of a man of genius, a benefactor, a hero of humanity. In this point of view we are true pagans, for our gods are many." [5]

Another president, addressing the masters and mistresses of schools, said: "You will oppose with success to the thick darkness with which teaching has always tried to veil and starve the minds of students, the teaching of science, which alone is true, for it gives to man the certainty of his proper worth, and impels him towards progress and light; while religious teaching plunges him fatally into an obscure night, and into an abyss of lamentable superstitions." [6]

[5] *Dieu, Patrie et Liberté*, p. 350. [6] Ibid. p. 351.

Once more, another president said: "Young citizenesses and young citizens, you have just been told that we have driven God out of the school. It is an error. Nobody can drive out that which does not exist. No, God does not exist. We have only suppressed emblems."

The Prefect of the Seine in the Senate said of the most sacred of all emblems, "It is only a question of school furniture."

It will perhaps be said that all this is mere official chatter. We will therefore close this dismal narrative with a scene from Senators and *Préfets*.

The Minister of Public Instruction maintained in the Senate that "the name of God is an equivocal term, because it was equally applicable to the God of Christians and to the God of Descartes." [7]

In the Conseil-Général of the Seine, on the 22nd of December 1882, M. Robinet moved: "That the ministerial instruction of the 27th of July 1882, which renders obligatory the teaching of Deism, is in absolute opposition to the text and the spirit of the law." This was signed by six other members of the Conseil, one of whom said: "Nobody can prove the existence of God, and teachers must not be forced to affirm the existence of an imaginary being." The Conseil finally voted: "That the teaching in all degrees of schools must be essentially lay." Is, then, a belief in the existence of God the essential difference between clericalism and laicism? M. Simon well says, "This neutrality has been imposed by atheists, and voted solely for their

[7] *Dieu, Patrie et Liberté*, p.

own interests against the faith and conscience of the immense majority of the French people."

I will give only one more fact before summing up the warning of the last ten years in France. On the 2nd of July 1881, M. Simon addressed the Minister of Instruction in the Senate in these words: "You will not have the words 'religious morality.' You say they are equivocal." "Say the teachers shall instruct their pupils in their duties towards God and towards their country."

Some of the Senators cried out: "There is no such thing as morality." Two days after this the Commission reported that the amendment was "useless, equivocal, and even dangerous." Nevertheless, the Senate passed it by a great majority. It was foreseen that the Chamber would reject it, because the name of God was *suspect de cléricalisme*. It was rejected: *on bifa Dieu*. God was struck out. M. Simon adds:

"They had put out ecclesiastics and religious from the primary education. They had banished from the communal schools the symbols and emblems of religion. They had pursued the neutralisation of the schools to the most minute details. They had officially declared from the tribune that to speak of God without specifying whether it was of the God of Christians, or of the Jews, or of the Mohammedans, was equivocal, and that the introduction of that word into a law is a public danger.[8] The atheists make the law. This is pushing the respect for minorities very far."[9]

Well may M. Simon say:

"We have abased those who have intelligence by subjecting them to the mob, and we have abased the mob by taking its faith from it. There, in two words, is our history.

The elected wield over the ministers the despotism that the electors wield over them. The ministers obey the deputies, the deputies the electors, the electors the demagogues, and what is

[8] *Dieu, Patrie et Liberté*, p. 371. [9] Ibid. p. 258.

the result? It is that at home there is no government, and abroad there is no France." [10]

I will add only one remark. Such is the development of godless education in France since the year 1871—that is, in the same twelve years that the Board School system has been confirming its grasp upon the English people. We will go on to the parallel.

III. In the year 1700 the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge was founded. One of its first and chief efforts was the religious education of youth. The popular education of children had not as yet become systematic. The domestic life of the people had not as yet given way as it has since. Home life still survived. Our great peril at this day is the homeless state of our masses. In the year 1808 the British and Foreign School Society was founded, to give elementary secular learning with the reading of the Bible. In 1811 the National Society was founded by the Established Church. Until 1833 the Government seems to have done nothing. In that year 20,000*l.* was voted to be divided between the British and Foreign and the National Societies. For six years this vote was continued. In 1839 the subject was taken up in the House of Commons. No one at that time dreamed of separating religious from secular instruction. The battle was between those who contended that the State ought to help in education, and those who denied that the State had anything to do with education. This theory was not the contention of Anglicans or of Catholics, but of the Congregationalists. In this pro-

[10] *Dieu, Patrie et Liberté*, pp. 372, 378.

longed conflict, in the year 1847, Lord Macaulay made one of his most powerful speeches, rejecting with indignation both the theory that the State should do nothing in education, and that the State should do everything, which is the revolutionary or communistic doctrine now troubling America, tyrannising over France, and threatening England.

Parliament in 1839 fully recognised that the whole popular education of England had been created and sustained by the religious instincts and Christian self-denial of the English people. It therefore wisely and justly so framed its legislation as to give State aid to voluntary efforts, respecting as sacred the rights of conscience. This is, in fact, what is called the Denominational system or State co-operation with religious liberty. From 1847 to 1851 the Government was engaged in making separate concordats with the several religious bodies. But the whole negotiation was based upon the principle enunciated by the Lords of the Privy Council in a letter of the 4th of July 1840:

"Their Lordships are strongly of opinion that no plan of education ought to be encouraged in which intellectual instruction is not subordinate to the regulation of the thoughts and habits of the children by the doctrines and precepts of revealed religion."

Lord John Russell was the author and prime mover in this whole policy. What was enunciated in 1840 he repeated on April 11, 1856:[11]

"One and all maintain that it is the duty of the Government, that it is part of the functions of the Government, to endeavour to teach somewhat of their duty to God and man, to the young as well as to the old."

[11] *Hansard*, cxli. 390.

A commission under the presidence of the late Duke of Newcastle reported as follows:

"It (the education system) has enlisted in the promotion of education a large amount of religious activity; and avoiding all unnecessary interference with opinion, it has practically left the management of the schools in the hands of the different religious denominations. In these respects it has been most successful."[12]

Such was the system of popular education down to the year 1870.

The first disturbing question in this settlement was the Conscience Clause. The demand was most reasonable on the part of Nonconformists in places where they could have no school of their own. But it was the grit which set the wheel on fire. And "the religious difficulty" was used by those who desired a pure secular system as a wedge to split in two the religious and secular instruction in our schools.

The Birmingham Education League led the assault. Its programme was as follows:

"National Education League.

Object.

The establishment of a system which shall secure the education of every child in England and Wales.

Means.

1. Local authorities shall be compelled by law to see that sufficient school accommodation is provided for every child in their district.

2. The cost of founding and maintaining such schools as may be required shall be provided out of the local rates, supplemented by Government grants.

3. All schools aided by local rates shall be under the management of local authorities, and subject to Government inspection.

4. All schools aided by local rates shall be unsectarian.

[12] Report, p. 327.

5. To all schools aided by local rates admission shall be free.

6. School accommodation being provided, the State or the local authorities shall have power to compel the attendance of children of suitable age not otherwise receiving education." [13]

The Act of 1870 was brought in and justified on the ground of the vast numbers of schoolless children outside of the voluntary education of the country. Rather than describe the Act and its intentions in any words of mine, I will give it in the words of its authors.

In Committee on the Bill on the 16th of June 1870, Mr. Gladstone, then Prime Minister, said:

"The machinery of voluntary schools we found not only existing in this country, but overspreading it to an immense extent, and on every ground, whether of that which is due to the promoters of those schools, to their benevolent and self-denying labours and the success which they have obtained, or whether on the ground of that which is due to the purpose which we have in view, and its effectual, speedy, uniform, and economical attainment, we adopted this principle also as a fundamental principle of this Bill, that we would frankly and without jealousy endeavour to employ the machinery of voluntary schools, as far as it was available, in aid of our object. But feeling that that large deficiency which is now observable in the country could not be made up by means of voluntary schools alone, we propose to fall back on the principle of rating, and to make use of it by way of supplementing the gap which we saw before us. . . . We may either forbid or compel a local board to aid voluntary schools; but if we forbid them, and make them leave voluntary schools, as they are, dependent on the modicum of aid which they now obtain from the Privy Council, that would not be consistent with the view with which this Bill was brought forward, and it would not fulfil the engagement under which all along we have admitted ourselves to lie—namely, that of giving fair terms to voluntary schools, so as to enable them to lend us all the aid they are capable of lending in the accomplishment of this great work, in which there is plenty for us all to do. Therefore, as our sole measure for dealing with that part of the case, we cannot forbid

[13] Report of the First General Meeting of the National Education League, Birmingham, 1869.

the local boards to give aid to voluntary schools, because the promoters of those schools would be liable, equally with others, to contribute to the rate, and, contributing to it, to aid and found schools to compete with and beat down the school for which they were paying out of their own private resources. This is a state of things we do not desire to bring about, and cannot be responsible for."

On the 24th of June 1870, Mr. Gladstone used these words:

"As regards the existing denominational schools, it is a very grave and important question which we have to ask ourselves—whether we are frankly, ungrudgingly, willingly, and systematically to make use of that powerful agency for the purpose of good secular instruction, which is placed at our command in a great degree, if not exclusively, through the vigorous action of religious zeal and love? Let us not disguise from ourselves that this is a question of the greatest moment. The answer to it, I own, appears to me to be perfectly clear. The answer is, that nothing but folly could induce us to refuse to avail ourselves of an opportunity so valuable. If we do not avail ourselves of it, if we treat those voluntary schools as institutions either to be proscribed, or, at the best, only to be tolerated, limited, hemmed in, permitted to exist merely because they do exist—as things which it is not worth our while to recognise, or honour, or encourage, on what principle can we justify such a policy? On none that I know of, but that secular instruction becomes tainted by being brought into the neighbourhood of specific religious teaching. Under the provisions of the Bill the secular instruction given in the voluntary schools will be severely tested, and care will be taken that it shall be of as high a quality as that given in the rate-supported schools. It will be cheaper to the public, though it be dearer to the individual. On what principle, then, can we refuse to avail ourselves of the advantages which it is calculated to confer?"

On the 28th of June 1870, Mr. Gladstone said:

"Of course it was desirable that the promoters of voluntary schools should have full confidence in the general principles on which Parliament proceeded, and the Government admitted the necessity of the motion of the hon. member for Oldham (Mr. Hibbert), and of showing that it was in the mind of Parliament,

as a part of the measure, to provide increased means for the support of voluntary schools."

On the 22nd of July 1870, on the third reading of the Bill, Mr. Gladstone said:

"It was with us an absolute necessity—a necessity of honour and a necessity of policy—to respect and to favour the educational establishments and machinery we found existing in the country. It was impossible for us to join in the language or to adopt the tone which was conscientiously and consistently taken by some members of the House who look upon these voluntary schools, having generally a denominational character, as admirable passing expedients, fit, indeed, to be tolerated for a time, deserving all credit on account of the motives which led to their foundation, but wholly unsatisfactory as to their main purpose, and therefore to be supplanted by something they think better. That is a perfectly fair and intelligible theory for any gentleman to entertain, but I am quite sure it will be felt that it has never been the theory of the Government."

Such were the assurances of the Prime Minister in 1870.

Perhaps I shall be ascribing too much importance to a chance and extra-Parliamentary utterance if I quote the following words spoken by the present President of the Board of Trade at Birmingham, as reported in the *Daily Post* of the 16th of January in this year. They are so diametrically at variance with the words of Mr. Gladstone, they are so hostile and so full of menace —they are also a declaration so explicit of the Gambettist programme for England—that it may be well to draw out their full meaning. The italics are mine:

"It seems to me that this is neither more nor less than a great revolution affecting all our social prospects and conditions, and in view of such a change as that, I confess I am less inclined now to go back upon the defects and omissions of the Act of 1870 than I am to congratulate all who were concerned in that

measure, beginning with its author, down to those who took the smallest part in the agitation which made the introduction of the measure possible; to congratulate them on the results which have been attained, and the success which has attended its operations. In this stage of success we may well be content to wait without impatience *until the example which is being set us by other countries*, and our own experience, may bring about those further developments and reforms which will be shown to be necessary and expedient. The only question is, however, whether the controversy may not be reopened from another quarter, and in that case I daresay we shall not shrink, as my friend Mr. Dale has very recently shown, from a discussion we shall not have provoked. But I would be inclined to ask our old opponents—our friends, I will call them now—the advocates of denominational education—whether they are wise to raise again a controversy to the settlement of which we have, *with considerable reluctance, and for a time, at all events, submitted.* I do not wonder that they are occasionally a little uneasy. They see their voluntary contributions diminishing, although not very materially; they find the competition of the Board Schools every day more vigorous; and under those circumstances it has suggested itself to some of them, perhaps not unnaturally, that it would be convenient that they should put their hand into the pocket of the ratepayer as well as of the taxpayer; and that it would relieve them from a good deal of difficulty if they could have a share of the School Board rate. *I would beg them to remember how much they have got already, and how little right they have to it.* . . . We thought in 1870 that when the State undertook national education for itself, the partnership which had up to that time existed with the State might be very well dissolved; and that the State having provided national schools, if there were any people who were unwilling to avail themselves of the education which was there provided, and wanted anything else, they must pay for it entirely by themselves. *But still we submitted, with more or less willingness according to the graciousness of our disposition*, to the compromise under which at the present time something like $1\frac{1}{4}$ million sterling is annually taken from the public taxes of the country, and paid over to the private managers of schools, which are mainly kept up by them, and avowedly kept up by them for *sectarian* purposes. I say that if the controversy is reopened we are bound to point out that there are also two sides to the question. It is interesting to observe in what direction public opinion is tending. Mr. Mundella has spoken of the *gigantic*

efforts which are being made in France in order to further national education in that country. The present position of the question owes much to *that great Republican* who has just died, and the premature termination of whose illustrious career is a *loss not to France only, but to the Liberal cause throughout the country.* But in France M. Gambetta made it a chief point in his policy to draw a sharp line of distinction between the Church and the State in all matters of education; and it is in that direction, I do not hesitate to say, that the *thoughts of men and the action of legislatures are constantly tending.*"

I need not point out the contrast of these speeches. In the utterances of 1870 we have the intentions of men whose goodwill was perhaps greater than their foresight. In the Birmingham speech we have the aspirations of 1869 verified by the twelve years of our experience. Mr. Chamberlain gives voice to the confident hopes of those who have during that time made the Act of 1870 their own. We have no right, they say, to exist but by the graciousness of dispositions. The present working of the Act is a prelude to a time when Christian schools shall be in England as in France, outside the law. The Birmingham scheme is the first instalment of "the Lay Church of England." Let us briefly contrast the two systems.

In the French system the whole education of the people, from the University to the primary schools, is, like the army and navy, governmental. Colleges, lycées, schools secondary and primary, belong to the State. The professors, masters, mistresses are patented by the State. The youth and children of France are claimed by the State. The formation of the citizens is the right and prerogative of the State. This policy is the legacy of paganism left by the First Revolution,

transmitted with modifications and checks by the First Empire to the Voltairean monarchy of 1830, and now developed once more by the Extreme Left of the Republic into its original Communistic excess by M. Challemel-Lacour and M. Paul Bert. The "moral unity of France" means the extinction of all forms of religion, belief, thought, consciousness, or moral life, which resist the uniform type of the French citizen taught, trained, shaped, fashioned, and drilled, by an education in which the existence of God is a superstition, the name of God an equivocal term, and the moral law a group of conventional usages. The apostles of the First Revolution had read their Plato. The Communists of to-day have inherited his Republic without the trouble of reading. Children are not the children of their fathers and mothers, but of the State. The State is *loco parentis*. Citizens are to be reared like cattle, and to be broken like horses. Parental rights are absorbed in the State; the rights of the State are supreme. It is the State that forms men in its own image and likeness, and stamps them with its own superscription. M. Simon says, "The miserable and sterile society that such education would produce would be in France an edition of one man in thirty-six millions of copies."[14] Such unity, he truly says, is death. The government that does everything in education destroys parental rights, energies, and sense of responsibility. Parents are no more responsible for the intellectual and moral formation of their offspring than they are, as we are told, for the gaslight in the

[14] *Dieu, Patrie et Liberté*, p. 252.

public streets. If the people of England are prepared for this condition of domestic and national life, I do not know them. But if the present working of the Act of 1870 be perpetuated, to this they will come; for the perpetuity of the Board School system means its extension, and its extension means the gradual extinction of the voluntary efforts and the self-providing and self-governing character of our people.

There still exists at this time in full vigour our great national system of education springing from the free will of the people, and maintained, as it was created, by their generosity and self-denial. This system, which I take leave still to call National, as distinguished from governmental, is both voluntary and Christian. It represents the mind and the Christianity of England from the time when England was made. No "universal, secular, gratuitous, and compulsory education" made our forefathers to be what they were, nor has it made Englishmen to be what they are now. We have no wish to be unmade and to be made over again. With all our faults we choose rather to remain a self-governing and a Christian people. We believe what has hitherto made us will continue its work. And we are convinced by the experience of the last ten or twelve years that a change is stealthily coming over our education. We have no wish for a "moral unity of England" to be brought about by universal Board Schools. I cannot refrain from here giving the words of M. Simon, which for eloquence and force can hardly be surpassed:

"We deceive ourselves (he says) about our schools, about their purpose and their importance, if we see in them only the propagation of knowledge. We ought to seek and to plant in them the propagation of courage and of virtue. For a century we have been transforming the forces of nature and subjecting them to the service of man; but man himself is, and will be to the end of time, the greatest force under heaven. Not because he knows he must die, but because he has the will to die for his duty. . . . To learn not to fail when our brethren or our country call is to learn our duty as man and as citizen. Let us found schools to enlighten the intellect, but above all to strengthen the will. A people innumerable, with a vast extent of soil, however fertile, if they lack initiative and courage, is destined to decline, defeat, and contempt, but a handful of men with heart of oak, cast upon an ungrateful soil, will either find or make a way to success and a future. . . . They will be like Rome, or Venice, or England, or Holland, starting from a corner of the earth to conquer the world. It is not the loss of a battle or the annihilation of an army, or a province torn away, that begins the fall of a people; a people dies only by the relaxation of its morals, by abandoning its manly habits, by the effacement of its character through the invasion of egoism and scepticism. It dies of its corruption. It cannot die of its wounds." [15]

Such are the fears of a Frenchman for France under an education without religion. Such is his appreciation of England. If we betray or surrender our Christian schools, how long shall we deserve his words? I may be asked, What then would you have? I answer equality for all schools before the law, and equal participation for all schools in the help of public aid, so far as their secular education demands and deserves it. I ask not a shilling for religions, much less for "Churches," as I have said, and as they ought to know who have brought this charge. They ought to know because they can know it; but such knowledge would ruin a cry. The inequality, and I must there-

[15] *Dieu, Patrie et Liberté*, pp. 295, 296.

fore say the injustice, of the present working of the Act of 1870 is patent, and cannot be disproved. Why should those who do nothing for themselves receive twofold aid, and they who tax themselves to the utmost receive nothing but what they earn? This has not been answered.

This inequality does not, I believe, exist in the Act itself. It results from subsequent minutes and codes and bye-laws.

The Act of 1870 embodies certain principles which all accept, that education shall be universal, and that it shall be provided for those who cannot provide for themselves.

The Act of 1870 does not embody the principle of excluding any schools, efficient in secular teaching, from State aid; nor does it purpose to destroy voluntary schools, nor does it desire to desecrate education by the exclusion of religion, nor does it accept even by instalment the French governmental despotism for the education of free England. All these things may be the aims, desires, and intentions of individuals in private and in public life. They were not the intentions of the Legislature. They are not yet to be read in our laws.

No one, therefore, asks for the repeal or the rescinding of the Act of 1870. As it was first drafted it would have met with wide acceptance. If it be restored now to what it was, a readjustment to the actual needs and rightful claims of the people at large might be easily effected.

We have in full action now, in the matter of educa-

tion, the same two principles which pervade our public life—the one the aid of Government, the other the voluntary efforts of the people. Down to the year 1870 these two worked harmoniously and efficaciously in co-operation, and, though distinct, yet in undivided unity. The first breach between them dates from the year 1870. The Education Act gave occasion for the separation, and the subsequent working has not only completed the separation, but has brought the two agencies, hitherto mutually helpful, into antagonism.

The effects of restoring once more the equal and just co-operation of the State and the voluntary efforts of the people would be:

First, to lighten the rates by eliciting more abundant voluntary contributions throughout the whole population.

Secondly, to awaken still more powerfully throughout the country a zeal, energy, and effort in the work of education which has already done so much, and, if it had been more largely stimulated and encouraged, would have done incalculably more. It was the parsimony of Government, first with its 20,000*l.*, and at last with its 600,000*l.*, that dwarfed and discouraged the voluntary efforts of the people. What men think they can do they will try to do; what they think is impossible they will not attempt.

The extension and efficiency of education would be promoted by this large, equal, and just treatment of all classes and conditions of the people.

But a deeper good also would be insured, that is, the undiminished vigour of our national character,

which, with all its faults, is the most law-abiding, self-governed, and mutually equitable character in the old or the new world.

The "moral unity" of a people when no "religious difficulty" divides them is the highest, happiest, and best. But this cannot be.

The "moral unity" of a people drilled by State education and State pedagogues and State police is spectral and lifeless.

The moral union of a free people educating themselves by self-help and the public aid of the commonwealth in liberty of conscience and a healthy diversity of culture is the vigour and maturity of a nation. This is still within our reach. If we hold fast by our English and Christian inheritance of freedom and faith, it is ours, and it will uphold us. If by our inertness we suffer the theories of Paul Bert, or, I must add, of Birmingham, to fascinate our minds or our legislature, we shall steadily descend the inclined plane on which not the Act, but the working of the Act, of 1870 has placed the Christian education of England.

APPENDIX.

TO AMEND THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870.

(1886.)

I. The majority in Parliament in 1869-70 was Liberal and Nonconformist. The Act of 1870 was strictly a Liberal and Nonconformist measure.

II. The majority in the Parliament of 1885-6 is Conservative and Catholic. Many Liberals are opposed to the Act of 1870.

III. There is therefore at this moment the possibility of balancing the Act of 1870 by an Act which shall protect by permanent enactments the Voluntary and Christian schools of the country.

IV. This cannot be done by any repeal or substantial undoing of the Act of 1870 and the system of schools which has sprung from it, but it may be done by the extension of the principles of that Act with such modifications as will admit Voluntary and Christian schools within an educational law common to the whole people.

V. So long as the Conservatives and the Irish, or Catholic vote, are united this can be certainly accomplished, and even if the Irish vote should fall off from the Conservatives, and once more unite with a Liberal majority, we have reason to believe that the Irish members would oppose any Education Act which should subject the million and a half of Catholics, predomin-

antly Irish, resident in England to any anti-Catholic system of education. We cannot doubt that the Irish Bishops would lend their fullest influence to the Bishops in England in protecting the Catholic and the Irish population in England from any such oppression.

VI. And it is here that we need to be especially on our guard, because leading politicians have declared themselves to be in favour of denominational education in Ireland, but of common education for England.

VII. There are two obvious dangers in the present system of Government grants from the Imperial funds on which our schools at this moment depend altogether. The first danger is the great probability that they will be continually diminished, and some day altogether cease; the other, that the control of a central fund by Government may become the most powerful means of a central and despotic Government education like that of France.

VIII. As to the cessation of grants from the Imperial funds, it is to be borne in mind that the whole stream of legislation for many years has steadily set in the direction of throwing off all burdens from the Imperial funds upon the local rates throughout the country. The Home Office has already thrown off a portion of the maintenance of the industrial schools upon the county rates. There can be little doubt that enlarged county government will soon be established, and upon the county rates all that can be thrown will be thrown. If the Voluntary schools shall continue to depend upon Government grants only, and shall be per-

manently excluded from participation in the rates, they will hereafter be in manifest danger of extinction.

IX. On the other hand, the willingness of certain advanced Liberals to make primary schools free out of Government grants is proof enough that they see clearly how great a central power thereby exists ready to their hand.

X. It would seem, therefore, that the present condition of the Voluntary schools, taken at the best, is either precarious or perilous, and prudence seems to dictate that we should use this unprecedented condition of Parliamentary balance, which may never return, to redress the inequalities created by the Act of 1870, and to place the Voluntary schools on the broad basis of a law common to the whole people of the country, which can never be assailed without assailing the interests of all schools alike.

XI. With this view, the following suggestions are made:

1. That the principle of the school rate, contained in the Act of 1870, be extended to the whole of the country.

2. That the principles contained in the Reformatory Schools Act and in the Industrial Schools Act of 1886 shall be applied to primary schools.

XII. The principle of the school rate is so obvious as to need no comment. The principles of the Reformatory and Industrial Schools Acts are as follows:

1. The Secretary of State for the Home Department has power to certify any schools that fulfil the requisite conditions as schools authorised to

receive children either convicted or committed by the magistrates.

2. The requisite conditions are that the school buildings and ground attached shall be sufficient for the uses and health of the children.

3. That the schools be open to the inspection and visitation of the Home Office in all matters relating to education, to the sanitary state, and to the well-being of the children, together with an audit of its accounts.

4. The schools may be undertaken by any private managers, on whom falls altogether the cost of the sites, of the buildings, of the management, and of the religious and moral discipline of the school.

XIII. These Acts have now worked for about thirty years with signal benefit in the reclaiming of children and in the diminution of crime in youth. There has been perfect harmony between the Government officials and the managers of the schools, who gladly acknowledge the benefit they have derived from the inspection and visitation of the Home Office. The limits of the inspection and visitation are fixed in the statute, and a long experience proves that there is no disposition either on the part of the officials to interfere with the responsibility of the managers, nor on the part of the managers in any way to thwart or to interfere with the inspection and visitation of the Government officials.

XIV. The source of such inspection and visitation would, as things now exist, be in the Government, but it would appear certain that when county government has been established, some part of these functions

might be delegated to the authority of the county. It is even conceivable that some participation in these functions might be extended to the localities on which the rate is levied.

XV. As to the officials of Government, no objection ought to be raised. As to the officials of counties, it can hardly be supposed that any danger would arise, inasmuch as the limits of inspection and visitation would be laid down in the statute law, and could not be exceeded without legal redress. As to any local inspection and visitation, under the same limitations by statute, no difficulties ought to arise, and a sufficient provision for the right exercise of such inspection and visitation might be easily obtained by the appointment of an official inspector of the Government, without whom no local visitation could take place.

XVI. An experience of nearly twenty years has proved that the most extensive local visitation can be carried on not only with perfect safety, but with great advantage. Thirty Boards of Guardians of the metropolitan district, year by year, visit some twenty boys' schools and girls' schools in London. The maintenance of the children is derived from the rates. The schools and their administration belong to the managers. The guardians visit in any numbers, at any time, and without notice. They have free access to all that relates to their legal power of visitation, and they record their opinions, objections, or approval in books kept for that purpose. It does not appear why a system which has been so long tried with perfect peace, goodwill, and contentment should not be applied to our primary

schools—above all, when it is remembered that the schools visited by the guardians are boarding-schools, with all the manifold circumstances of management, often very complicated. The primary schools are open and used only for four hours a day, and have comparatively little matter for visitation.

XVII. But, it may be asked, what is to become of the 4000 Board schools which in the last fourteen years have been established on rates and Government grants without an effort or a sacrifice on the part of their promoters? Their whole cost in creation and in maintenance depends on public money. If they were to be thrown in any measure upon voluntary contribution, they would be certainly reduced to straits. Let it for a moment be supposed that they are left to continue as they are. Two beneficial effects at least would still be obtained—their needless multiplication would be arrested, and freedom with power would be restored to the Voluntary schools to multiply themselves, according to the needs of the people, and the self-denial of those who are willing to found and to maintain them.

XVIII. But in the manifold needs and the future extension of national education some uses for the existing Board schools may be found which shall even extend the benefits of which they are capable, without obstructing the liberty of conscience and the freedom of action of those who are in conscience opposed to the condition which has been created by the Act of 1870, believing it to be fraught with consequences and with influences dangerous to the national character and the Christianity of the people of this country.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A COMMON SYSTEM OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

(August 1887.)

I. The Education Act of 1870 has rooted itself far too deeply in the last seventeen years, and has endowed itself far too abundantly by the outlay of millions of money, to make it prudent, even if it were possible, to propose either to rescind or substantially to modify it. It must be taken, therefore, as an accomplished fact.

II. A distinction may be drawn between the Act of 1870 and its subsequent administration. The latter may be modified without touching the principles of the Act itself.

III. The principles of the Act are three:

1. That elementary education shall be made universal.

2. That an education rate shall be imposed and collected for that purpose.

3. That the expenditure of the rate and the management of schools maintained by it shall be administered by local authorities.

IV. The authors and friends of the Act of 1870 can desire nothing more than that these three principles

should be carried out to the fullest extent over the face of the whole country.

V. The managers and friends of Voluntary schools would make no opposition to such an extension of these three principles, provided that the principle of Voluntary schools and freedom of conscience in religion be recognised and incorporated in one common system of national education.

VI. With a view to describe such a system of national education, the following suggestions are offered:

In the Report of the Royal Commissioners on Education in 1860, it was recommended: "That all assistance given to the annual maintenance of schools shall be simplified and reduced to grants of two kinds.

"The *first* of these grants should be paid out of the general taxation of the country, in consideration of the fulfilment of certain conditions by the managers of the schools. Compliance with these conditions is to be ascertained by the inspectors.

"The *second* should be paid out of the county rates, in consideration of a certain degree of knowledge by the children of the school during the year preceding the payment. The existence of this degree of knowledge shall be ascertained by examiners appointed by county and borough Boards of Education hereinafter described."

The Report proceeds to recommend, "That in every county, or division of a county, having a separate county rate, there shall be a county Board of Education appointed in the following manner: the Court of Quarter Sessions to elect not more than six, who again

shall not elect more than six; the ministers of religion not exceeding one-third of the number."

"That in corporate towns of more than 40,000 inhabitants, the Town Council may appoint a borough Board of Education of not more than six persons, of whom not more than two shall be ministers of religion" (*Report of the Commissioners*, pp. 544-5.)

VII. These passages are quoted only to give in outline what may still be recommended in the year 1887, eliminating all details as to the mode of election of county or borough Boards, and the number of persons to be elected.

VIII. Let it be supposed that the Committee of Privy Council and the Department shall remain unchanged, and its functions continue as they are; all legislation by Codes and Minutes, and all inspection-in-chief, and all ultimate appeals would remain as before.

IX. The county inspectors would be sub-inspectors, responsible ultimately to the Department.

X. The functions of all inspectors, and the limits of their inspection, would be laid down in the statute law, as in the case of reformatory and industrial schools.

XI. In the first draft of the Bill of 1870, the principle that all who pay should share was fully and fairly carried out. The enactment of the 14th clause was inconsistent with the first draft of the Bill and with the intention of its authors. Its effect has been to create an inequality which is unjust in the treatment of the Voluntary schools. By that clause they are absolutely excluded from all participation in the education rate,

which they are, nevertheless, compelled to pay. The 14th clause ought to be abolished.

XII. All schools, therefore, whether Voluntary or Board schools, would receive from the two sources of public revenue according to the recommendation of the Commission of 1860, though not in equal proportions. The Voluntary schools purchase their independence and protect their liberty of conscience in religion by voluntary contributions, and must always do so. Their participation in the rate would therefore be diminished in that proportion.

XIII. The multiplication of unnecessary schools could be guarded against hereafter as now, the ultimate appeal being, as now, from the local boards to the Department.

XIV. The unity of education and inspection could not be maintained if the framing of Codes and Minutes should reside anywhere but in the central Department; but no Code ought to have force until it has lain on the table of the House in print for three months, and has been published to the heads of all those bodies with whom, by the Minutes of 1847, the Government is in contract.

XV. The Act of 1870 will need interpretation in four primary points: namely, the meaning and limits of the word *elementary* as applied to education; the meaning and extent of the word *suitable*, and the meaning of the word *shall*, in clauses giving power to School Boards to supply additional schools. Finally, the meaning of the term *unnecessary*, as applied to Denominational schools.

THE FUTURE OF THE PRIMARY SCHOOLS.

(*The Month.*)

THE future of the primary schools is really the future of the people of England. Such as is the education of the children, such will be the men of the next generation. I confine what I say to England, for the state both of Ireland and of Scotland is widely different from the state of the English people.

We hear much of our national character. What is it? Is it a fixed intellectual and moral type, which reproduces itself by a natural law, or is it a result of certain conditions, such as the influence of homes, the training of childhood, the controlling force of public opinion, of political institutions, and of religious teaching? If it depends on all these things, and in truth it does; and if all these have been and are continually changing, then their result must have proportionably changed, and the national character of to-day is not the national character of fifty years ago. One proof is enough. For six hundred years Parliament, which is the chief index of our national character, has known how to govern itself without closures and surgical appliances for keeping order. The national character was calm, grave, and deliberate. Order was its normal state; disorder abnormal. Our national character has been steadily though imperceptibly

changing, and the House of Commons has lost the gravity of self-control which made it the wonder of foreign Chambers and Parliaments. What has this to do with our primary schools? Everything. It is Parliament that frames our Education Acts and fashions our primary schools at its will.

Till 1870 the primary education of England was voluntary and Christian. Since 1870 one half of the population of England is under a system which is neither Christian nor voluntary, but secular and compulsory.

Can two systems so diametrically opposite in kind and efficacy produce one and the same result? The national character was chiefly formed in its Christian schools. What character will be formed in schools without Christianity?

Already this is proved in the United States. The Common School system is bearing its fruits. And it will be even more perceptible among us in England, because the education of our Voluntary schools was, until 1870, chiefly religious. Its secular teaching was less precisely and sedulously cared for than its Christian teaching and discipline. This was turned to our reproach. Our condition at present is this. The Board schools instruct a million of children in secular matter, but exclude all distinctive Christian doctrine. The Voluntary schools are reduced during the school day to secular schools. No Christian doctrine can be taught in them except out of hours. They are subject to the fierce competition of Board schools supported out of inexhaustible rates; taught by teachers receiving salaries

double in amount compared with those of Voluntary schools; armed with the attractions of costly buildings and ample playgrounds, and all that public money can provide. In ten years they have drawn to themselves a million of children—nearly half the number gathered by the Voluntary schools in fifty years. Can it be doubted that, in this unequal race, the system which is promoted by public law, paid for by public money, will not only check and outstrip, but starve and crush the system which lives only by private zeal and private self-denial; or, in other words, that the primary education of Christian England will, in a generation or two, be no longer in Christian schools but in secular schools? We cannot gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles. A Christian people can never spring from secular schools, and neither private zeal nor home education will suffice to supply the Christian teaching and formation which is excluded from the secular schools of the State.

The advocates of the secular schools were chiefly Nonconformists, who asserted that religion would be sufficiently taught at home and in Sunday-schools. Already we hear some of themselves declaring that Sunday-schools reach only the few that voluntarily attend, but do not reach the majority. Already we are told that the sons of Nonconformist homes are departing from the religion of their forefathers. But the poor of England are not Nonconformists. The Nonconformists are for the most part above the poor. They are the middle class. The Nonconformists are hardly to be found in poor schools. And the Board schools

are therefore being managed especially under their influence. The primary schools of England are chiefly filled by the children of the Established Church, of the Catholic Church, and of the Wesleyans. These three bodies are the religious educators of the English people, and it is especially their Voluntary schools that are now oppressed by the unequal favour shown by the Act of 1870 to the schools of the minority.

Let us never lose sight of the inheritance which is now at stake. Two systems are at this time in conflict.

On one side is the system of secular education, which as yet is only partially developed in England. It contains, nevertheless, in itself the principles fully developed in France, namely:

1. That education primarily and properly belongs to the State.
2. That the schools belong to the State.
3. That the children belong to the State.
4. That the State has no religion.
5. That the formation of the national character belongs to the State.
6. That the formation of the teachers of the people belongs to the State.
7. That no one shall teach the people except by patent of the State.

In a word, we are being stealthily drawn into a pass where these principles are foregone conclusions already embodied in the law of the land; and irresistible in their future application.

On the other side is the traditional Christian

education of the English people, which rests upon the following principles :

1. That the children of a Christian people have a right by Divine law to Christian education.

2. That Christian parents have a twofold right and duty, both natural and supernatural, to guard this inheritance of their children.

3. That Christian children are in no sense the children of a State that has no religion.

4. That their teaching and training, or formation as Christians, is of higher moment than all secular instruction, and may not be postponed to it, or risked to obtain it.

5. That in the selection of teachers to whom their children shall be intrusted, Christian parents have a right and a duty which excludes all other human authority.

6. That to deprive the poor of this right and liberty, which is claimed by and yielded to the rich, is a flagrant injustice.

Let no one be deceived by thinking that these two systems can be reconciled or mingled with each other. They are mutually exclusive. We have to choose between them. The sooner we make up our mind the safer for us. Every year we are losing ground. Every year the antagonist system, fraught with antagonistic principles, is penetrating the legislation and structure of the commonwealth, and tainting the brain and blood of the governing classes. It has already reduced the national Universities to schools of secular science and secular literature. It is throwing off Christianity from

the public life of the State, and relegating it to the private life of men. If the primary schools of England shall cease to be Christian schools, there may still be Christians in England, but the traditions of the English people will exist no longer. It will be Christian England only as it is Catholic France, by accident of numbers, or rather, by the compassion of God upon individuals, and not by its public law, or faith, or fidelity to God.

It is in this crisis of our country that God has once more restored to the Catholic Church both liberty and power. We are debtors above all men and to all men, to preserve inviolate, at all costs and at all privations, the unbroken and unimpaired tradition of Christian education in the whole circle of our colleges and schools, from the majestic and venerable Colleges of Stonyhurst and Ushaw to the primary schools of our humble missions in the green villages and in the busy towns of England.

IV.

AN ENGLISHMAN'S PROTEST.

(*Nineteenth Century*, August 1888.)

AN ENGLISHMAN'S PROTEST.

THREE months ago it was possible to write the following words: "The best example of a commonwealth which has lost its Catholic perfection without losing its traditional but imperfect Christianity, and has at the same time returned in great part to the natural order —that is, to the truths of natural religion and to the four cardinal virtues—may be said to be the British Empire."

But this British Empire was not the primitive Catholic monarchy of Alfred, in which Church and State were inseparable, and councils and parliaments sat simultaneously.

It was not the English monarchy of Henry the Seventh, in which, at least in public law, the unity of our spiritual and civil life was as yet unbroken.

It was not the monarchy of Elizabeth, of which Hooker could still write in his pleasant dream, that Church and State were coincident, and every member of the one was a member of the other.

It was not the monarchy of the Stuarts, or of William the Third, in which whole classes of men were excluded from civil rights and from legislative powers

because of nonconformity with the legalised form of Christianity.

Neither was it the British Empire of George the Fourth, when civil rights and legislative powers were thrown open to Catholics and to Protestants, who for three centuries had endured proscription and persecution, to fine, imprisonment, and death, for their Christian conscience.

Nor, lastly, was it the monarchy and Empire of Victoria, when civil rights and legislative powers were extended in full to all who, believing in the divine and imperishable Theism of the Hebrew Commonwealth, gave their allegiance under the same Divine sanctions to the Christian Empire of Great Britain.

Hitherto the British Empire has rested upon a twofold Divine base, both natural and supernatural. It was built up by our Saxon, Norman, and English forefathers, first upon the unity of Christendom; and next, even they who saw this unity wrecked, or had a hand in wrecking it, preserved of the Law Christian all that it was still possible to save. Our old jurists used to say that "Christianity was part and parcel of the law of England;" and our feather-headed political doctors ridiculed as bigotry a dictum which has created Christendom. They no doubt had never studied the incorporation of the Christian into the Imperial law; and, to take one only instance, they were probably unconscious how the Christian law of marriage in its unity and indissolubility changed the face of the Roman world; and equally unconscious how to this day the same Christian and Catholic law is the law of

England, notwithstanding the legal dissolutions of the Divorce Court.

But, lying deep below this Christian foundation of our Empire, there are the lights and the laws of the natural order: the truths known to man by the light of reason and by the instincts of humanity. The whole civil society of men in all its ages, apart from the commonwealth of Israel, the monarchies of Assyria and Persia, the liberties of Greek civilisation, the Imperial law and sway of old Rome, all alike rested upon the Theism of the natural order.

I may be asked: What is this Theism of the natural order? I answer: that God exists; that He is good, wise, just, and almighty; that He is our Lawgiver and our Judge; that His law, both eternal and positive, is the rule of our life; that we have reason by which to know it in its dictates of truth and of morals; that this law binds us in duties to Him, to ourselves, and to all men; that this law is the sanction of all personal, domestic, social, civil, and political life: in a word, without God there is no society of man, political, social, or domestic. Society springs from God, and lives by His pervading will. Deny the existence of God, and nine thousand affirmations are no more than nineteen or ninety thousand words. Without God there is no lawgiver above the human will, and therefore no law; for no will by human authority can bind another. All authority of parents, husbands, masters, rulers, is of God. This is not all. If there be no God, there is no eternal distinction of right and wrong; and if not, then no morals; therefore truth,

purity, chastity, justice, temperance are names, conventions, and impostures.

There are two conditions possible to men and empires. The one is the order of nature with its recognition of God, with its lights of reason and conscience, its laws and morality, its dictates of conscience and of duty, its oaths and sanctions of fidelity and truth. On this rested the great empires of the old world. It is the order of nature, but it is also Divine. There is another condition possible to individual men; and therefore, though hardly, to multitudes—that is, the state in which God and morality have passed out of the life and soul of man. This condition is not Divine; nor is it human, nor is it natural. I read its description in an inspired writer, and he says that such men are as the irrational creatures, the ἄλογα[1] who in the things they know naturally, in these they corrupt themselves.

But this is not the order of nature as God made it. In creating man, He created human society from its first outlines of domestic life to its full imperial grandeur as the world has seen it in Rome, and we see it now in the Greater Britain. Where the lights and the laws of nature, and conscience, and morals are lost, men become herds or hordes, but are civilised men no longer.

Sir William Blackstone, after quoting Sir Edward Coke as saying, "The power and jurisdiction of Parliament is so transcendent and absolute that it cannot be confined, either for causes or persons, within any bounds," goes on to say, "It can transcend the ordinary

[1] II. S. Peter ii. 12; S. Jude 10.

course of laws ; it can regulate the succession of the Crown ; it can alter the established religion of the land ; it can change and create afresh the Constitution of the kingdom." " So that it is a matter most essential to the liberties of this kingdom that such members be delegated to this important trust as are most eminent for their probity, their fortitude, and their knowledge ; for it was a known apophthegm of the great Lord Treasurer Burghley, that England could never be ruined but by a Parliament." Judge Blackstone further quoted the President Montesquieu, who foretold, that " as Rome, Sparta, and Carthage have lost their liberty and perished, so the Constitution of England will in time lose its liberty and will perish : it will perish whenever the legislative power shall become more corrupt than the executive." [2]

The purity of Parliament depends, therefore, upon the eminent probity, fortitude, and knowledge of its members. And these qualities are tested, so far as is in man, by the oath or solemn declaration of allegiance by which every man intrusted with a share in the supreme power of legislation binds himself by a sanction higher than that of any mere human authority to be faithful to the commonwealth. The oath of the Catholic members of Ireland, and of the Christian members of England and Scotland, and the affirmation of the members of the Hebrew religion, and the affirmation of the members for Birmingham and for Manchester, all alike bind their conscience by the

[2] Blackstone's *Commentaries*, by Robert Malcolm Kerr, vol. i. pp. 121, 129.

highest sanctions of the Divine law. So also, if there be any who, resting, as many in the last century did rest, on the Theism of the old world, and on the lights and laws of nature, affirm their probity and their allegiance under the sanctions which trained the *prisca virtus* of the Roman Commonwealth, of such men, under the obligations of the four cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude, enforced by the dictates of natural conscience and the eternal laws of morals, we feel sure. Their build and make is natural and human, in conformity with the common sense and patriotic traditions of the Christian civilisation of Europe, by which they were created and by which they are sustained, in a higher moral life than a defective belief can account for.

And such, three months ago, was the mixed foundation of the British Empire, a mingled system of gold and silver, brass and iron, and the good honest clay of the order of human nature as God made it, with its rights and laws, like our English mother earth, in which our secular oaks root deep and outlive generations and dynasties, but have not outlived the monarchy of England.

Thus far I have heard from my forefathers, and understood the English Constitution. It has a basis of two strata, both Divine: the one, the Law Christian; the other, the law of nature.

It knows nothing of a race of sophists who, professing to know nothing about God, and law, and right and wrong, and conscience, and judgment to come, are incapable of giving to Christian or to reasonable men

the pledges which bind their moral nature with the obligations necessary for the command of fleets and armies, and legislatures and commonwealths. Men will not intrust to them the august and awful powers of Parliament described by Lord Coke. The dearest, and tenderest, and most vital interests of life, and home, and welfare, depend upon legislation. Ten thousand times rather would I vote for an upright member of the Hebrew race, whose commonwealth stands in history as the noblest and most human, as well as the most Divine, government of man, than for the young gentlemen who cannot make up their mind whether God exists or no, or whether in the body they adorn and pamper there be a soul which will have to answer for all they have culpably done, and all they have culpably failed to know.

When Parliament, to meet the scruples of those who so firmly believed in the Majesty of God, that they doubted the lawfulness of adjuring Him by way of oath, relieved them by accepting a declaration, it rested its act on its profound belief of the reverence and fidelity of the Society of Friends to the Divine Lawgiver, Whom they feared to offend.

But let no man tell me that this respectful confidence is to be claimed by our Agnostics.

Much less by those, if such there be, who, sinking by the inevitable law of the human mind below the shallowness and timidity of Agnosticism, plunge into the great deep of human pride, where the light of reason goes out, and the outer darkness hides God, His perfections, and His laws.

No law of England has intrusted the powers of legislation to such men. Parliament has never yet weighed and voted the following resolution: "That the British Empire, having ceased to be Catholic, ceased to be Christian, and ceased even to be Theistic, has descended below the level of the order of nature and the political civilisation of the cultured and imperial races of the pagan world." We Englishmen still believe that it rests upon a level which the old world in all its demoralisation never destroyed. The French pantomime of the last century voted out and voted in the "Supreme Being." *Delicta majorum immeritus lues.* The French people of to-day have no tradition and no basis. It was one of their own wisest sons who said, "*Sans Dieu point de société.*" Where God and the unity of His Divine law cease to reign, there can be no commonwealth.

But Parliament has never yet made such a law. There still stands on our Statute-book a law which says that to undermine the principles of moral obligation is punishable by forfeiture of all places of trust;[3] but there is no law which says that a man who publicly denies the existence of God is a fit and proper person to sit in Parliament, or a man who denies the first laws of morals, is eligible to make laws for the homes and domestic life of England, Scotland, and Ireland. A by-vote has furtively opened the door to one whose notoriety relieves me of an odious duty. But Parliament has not yet confirmed that by-vote, and the moral sense of this great people has not yet been asked. Neverthe-

[3] 9 & 10 Will. III. c. 32. Kerr's *Blackstone*, iv. 34, 35, note.

less, it has been heard ; and I trust that there is still left in our statesmen at least the probity and the courage of Roman senators. One by-vote of a party majority, if not reversed, will lower for ever the basis of the British Empire. The evil it has wrought would be complete. It has laid down for ever that for the highest offices of man—namely, the making laws for man—it is no longer necessary for a man to be Catholic or Christian, or Jew or Theist. He may publicly deny and profane all these things. He may deny the existence of God, and therefore of Divine law, and therefore of all law except the human will and human passion. But as yet no statute of the Legislature has declared such men to be eligible to Parliament.

If, however, this by-vote be accepted, Lord Burghley's forecast will be on the horizon. England will begin to be destroyed by its Parliament.

THE PARLIAMENTARY OATH AND THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. Bradlaugh, finding that the law would not allow of his taking his seat without taking the oath, presented himself on Tuesday night at the table of the House of Commons to be sworn. Sir Stafford Northcote anticipated his act by moving, "That having regard to the resolution of this House on the 23rd of June 1880, and to the reports and proceedings of the two Select Committees therein referred to, Mr. Bradlaugh be not permitted to go through the form of repeating the words of the oath prescribed by the Statutes of 29 Victoria, chapters 19 and 31; and 32 Victoria, chapter 72." In his speech he reminded the House that the courts of law had twice decided that a member elected to sit in the House must take the oath: and that to make affirmation instead of oath does not qualify a member to take his seat; that Mr Bradlaugh had declared that to take an oath is a mere form: and that, therefore, he could not be admitted to swear.

The chief arguments on the other side were two. Mr. Bright said that the House was not warranted in taking cognisance of the religious or irreligious opinions of any man; and Mr. Gladstone said that whomsoever

a constituency shall elect, the House must admit to swear.

We have here a declaration of principles unknown to the Constitution of England. They are as follows: First, that a man if he takes an oath thereby sufficiently fulfils the legal obligation of swearing, though he may at the same time declare that an oath is a mere form; that he does not believe in God; and that his act lays no obligation on his conscience. And, secondly, that there is no qualification necessary to sit in Parliament, and to make our laws, save only the election of a constituency; so that either the words "a fit and proper person" to sit in Parliament have no meaning, or that a man who derides an oath while he takes it, is "a fit and proper person."

On this we have to say:

First, that the sanctity of an oath is recognised in all our laws; not only by the laws which require an oath to be made, and by the law which in certain cases permits an affirmation in its stead, but also by the laws which forbid all persons except those authorised by office to require of any one to swear. The sanctity of an oath rests on a belief in the existence of God. The conscience is bound by the adjuration of God; and even when affirmation is admitted in the place of oath, it rests upon the same belief of the existence of God. To reduce an oath to a mere form is contrary both to revealed and to natural morality; and to destroy the sanctity and obligation of an oath is to undermine the foundations of private and public life.

Secondly, it is new to the Constitution that the

House of Commons cannot refuse to admit an unfit or improper person, if only he shall have been elected by a constituency. This is a doctrine as monstrous as it is novel, and subverts Parliamentary government from its base.

Thirdly, it implies that no man is unfit or improper to make laws for Christian England and Catholic Ireland, if only he be a subject of the Crown, and not under conviction for crime.

Fourthly, it implies, further, a rejection of belief in God, and in natural morality, on which the civilisation of the old Roman world rested: declaring thereby that even a belief in Theism and in natural morals is not necessary as a foundation for the legislation of Christian England; or,

Fifthly, that England is Christian no longer; that its Christianity is the private opinion of individuals and is absolutely banished from its public life.

The general result of this is, that England and the British Empire have been descending steadily from level to level: from the unity of a Catholic State to a Christian but divided commonwealth; from a Christian commonwealth to a political order resting upon the lights, laws, and truths of natural religion and morality: and from this lowest level among men to what Mr. Bright on Wednesday well, but not wisely, called "a deep hole," that is, to the abyss, or to the great deep or bottomless pit of Positivism, Agnosticism, Atheism, where not only God is not, but is openly denied and blasphemed: where not only the moral law is not, but is deliberately denied to exist, and violations of it are

justified in ways of which the pagan world was guilty, but, at least, it never defended, still less commended to men, but deplored, rebuked, and was ashamed of.

To this end we are being steadily conducted, and on this theory the Government are proceeding to admit Mr. Bradlaugh to the House of Commons.

To this we were brought by a side-vote obtained by Mr. Gladstone and the Government in the last Session. The courts of law have declared that vote to be, in its effect, illegal. It has never become law by the action of the Legislature and by the consent of the Crown. It is, therefore, not as yet the law of England. It is simply an exercise of the supreme power of the House of Commons to decide who may, or who may not, take his seat in the House. And this is the power for which we are contending. But it was this power which Mr. Gladstone's argument on Tuesday night broadly denies. If any man elected at Northampton has thereby a right to sit in the House of Commons, the House has no power to decide who may take his seat on its benches. It has no power to decide whether any man is a fit and proper person to make our laws. Until now, one test of a fit and proper person to make laws for the Christian population of England and Scotland, and for the Catholic people of Ireland, is that he binds himself before the House, either by oath or by affirmation founded on the belief in God, and in the sanctity of such an act, to the due discharge of the office of legislating for a Christian people.

If this foundation is to be destroyed, let it be done openly, and not stealthily; directly, and not circuit-

ously; after express enunciation and full debate; and more, not by a Parliament taken unawares, but by a Parliament freely and consciously elected to try and to decide the question whether England be, and shall continue to be, a Christian commonwealth, or a State stripped even of natural lights and of natural morals. We are hanging over this bottomless deep, and have a right to demand that the Government shall go to the country before it move again a hair's breadth in the path which it pursued last Session.

ATHEISM AND THE CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND.

We must disencumber the question of the Parliamentary oath by separating it finally and altogether from the personality and idiosyncrasy of Mr. Bradlaugh. Some people think it unfortunate that the discussion should have been raised in connection with his election at Northampton. We, however, are glad it has been raised in a form and with circumstances which render all evasion impossible. But for this accident, we believe that a change of the Constitution of England would have been filched or stolen from the Legislature, as other Acts have been, with little or no perception at the time of what was doing, till the work was done. Now, at least, we see that the change proposed will henceforward admit any man, not under arrest for crime, to make our laws, if only he can find a constituency to elect him. This is not as yet the law of the land.

What, then, is the nature of an oath or affirmation as now by law required?

An oath is an invocation of God in witness of truth; and that oath may be either in the form of assertion in evidence as to fact; or of promise, as in the oath of fidelity or allegiance. The practice of making oath in attestation of truth and fidelity is to be found in the

whole history of the ancient world, Greek and Roman; in the laws of the Hebrew commonwealth; and in the laws and practice of the whole Christian world. There is not to be found a civilised nation of the ancient or modern world in which this practice has not been recognised as a test and security for the truth and fidelity of men. An oath does, indeed, presuppose a creed, as laughter presupposes humanity. To laugh is the act of an intelligent being, and to swear is the act of a man who believes in a Supreme Legislator and a Just Judge, before whom a perjurer or a traitor will be called to give account. Such has been the practice of all nations, in all ages, in their judicial and legislative acts. To depart from this is to change the whole basis, not only of Christian, or English, but of human society; it is to build, like the foolish builder, not upon the rock, but upon the sand.

To this we will return hereafter.

It is, therefore, altogether wide of the truth to say that the permission to make affirmation, instead of to take an oath, forms either precedent or argument for the case of those who deny the existence of God, and the obligation which the Divine Law lays upon the conscience. We are not a little surprised, and not at all favourably impressed, when we hear certain men argue in this fashion: "We believe in God; but we believe that He has forbidden us to swear. You, therefore, changed for our sakes the oath to an affirmation, and we then bound ourselves by our most solemn act. Our conscience forbids us to offend God by an oath; but our affirmation is morally equivalent and

equally binding. Therefore, let everybody, as we do, make only an affirmation, whether they believe with us in God and His law, or no. We, indeed, are theists; and they may be atheists. But that makes no difference: they and we ought to be placed on the same level." Certainly George Fox would not have accepted this equation.

This has been most unreasonably called making a "theistical test." We make nothing. We only refuse that the obligations of natural religion should be unmade. If men secretly reject the belief of a Supreme Being, we cannot alter the laws which are founded upon the belief and practice of mankind, for the sake of meeting their abnormal state. Human society is founded upon its own lights, laws, instincts, and intuitions. It legislates for the common sense of men, not for anomalies and morbid exceptions. The Ten Commandments cannot be repealed because men break them. Laws must not give way because they are evaded or derided.

But it may be said: "Why not take a promise of allegiance without recognition of God as the Judge of truth and fidelity?" We answer: "Because we know of no obligation sufficient to bind men, except the acknowledgment of a Tribunal higher than man." In all mutual contracts between man and man, a promise presupposes a law of justice, and a Judge who will require its fulfilment. All the relations of human life, domestic, social, civil, political, rest upon this foundation. The mutual contracts of men need a higher sanction than mere human law. There can be no

responsibility except either to God, or to the executioner. We must obey either for wrath or for conscience' sake. There is nothing between these. No laws or contracts will long hold out against the interests, and passions, and ambitions, and resentments of men, unless they be confirmed and sanctioned by a recognition of a Divine Legislator and a Divine Judge. The guillotine failed to hold together the French Republic, when the *Etre Suprême* had been abolished. Every stone in the whole fabric was loosened. All the relations of domestic and of civil life were dissolved. They depended no longer upon the will of God, but upon the will of man; and the will of man had no power over the wills of men, except as the penalty of death cuts short the contentions between them. There can be no law without a legislator; and no law of universal obligation, except that which comes from a Lawgiver to whom all must give account. So true it is, that "without God there is no human society." From Him come the symmetry, the cohesion, and the life of homes and of States.

We have already affirmed that never until now has this issue been raised in England. Before the high trust of making laws for us is committed to any man, the commonwealth has a right to know what manner of man he is. It makes no inquisition into his religious opinions. But it has not only a right, it is bound by a peremptory duty to see that those who are to make its laws are such as at least the Roman Senate would have admitted to such a supreme trust. To call this a "sentiment," is to trifle with us. We have a right to

claim that any man who makes our laws about education, and public morals, and divorce, shall at least believe in God. If anybody be pleased to call this a "test," or a "sentiment," be it so. The English, Scotch, and Irish are a Christian people, and the Constitution of this Christian country ought not to be changed without a distinct appeal to the public opinion of the United Kingdom. The great majority of the people have already unequivocally declared for religious, as against mere secular education. So far as we have heard they are equally opposed to atheism. The Catholic population may be taken to be as one man against the Government in this matter. Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. A. M. Sullivan, and Mr. Arthur O'Connor have spoken as true representatives of the Catholics of Ireland, England, and Scotland. The great majority of the Church of England would most certainly vote in the same sense. As to the Nonconformists we are perplexed. They are, above all men, bound to uphold the religious character of our national life. But we have witnessed strange confusion in their ranks, and have seen with sorrow the hauling down of the old standard of zeal for truth, and the hoisting of the vane of political expediency. Nevertheless, we will believe, till we see the contrary, that they would stand for the rights of God over our national life and laws.

If this be so, then there would be a vast majority against the change which the Government desires to make; and we repeat that the question ought to be put to the test of a General Election. For this cause, we refuse to treat it as a Bradlaugh case, or as a North-

ampton case. It is an attempt to reduce the Legislature and Constitution of this country to a level lower than the Old World. It was sunk, indeed, but it was still pervaded by a recognition of a Supreme Being as a law-giver and a judge. Such a change in our Constitution would be the breaking of the cables which hold us to our past. Until now the anchors have held us to the shore where the lights of revelation are still burning, and the laws of nature are still revered. While France and Germany have drifted towards the gulf of unbelief, we have been stayed in our descent. If the people of England, by their public voice, shall decree it otherwise, we shall from that day know where we are. But let the people be appealed to, and let the people decide; let no side-vote, nor sudden action, anticipate its verdict. Let the Government pass its Land Bill; and after that take the sense of the country on this perilous and fatal issue: "Do we, or do we not, as a nation, rest upon the laws of God? or do we hang over the great deep, in which there is neither a Divine light in the reason, nor a Divine law written upon the conscience of man?"

V.

AN ENGLISHMAN'S PROTEST.

(*Nineteenth Century* 1880.)

AN ENGLISHMAN'S PROTEST.

I HAVE no inclination to renew the painful memories of Tuesday, the 21st, and Wednesday, the 22nd of February. They tarnish many names, and leave many a regret which will live long in history. The sum of the case is easy. The House of Commons vindicated its own authority. It expelled a member, and issued a new writ. While the parties are preparing for a new election, we will take a review of the arguments for and against Mr. Bradlaugh's claim to sit as member for Northampton.

The following list will be found, I believe, to contain a fair and accurate statement of the reasons urged by the speakers in Parliament and by the newspapers out of Parliament in support of Mr. Bradlaugh's claim to take his seat in the House of Commons. It is said:

1. That it is inquisitorial to inquire what a man elected to Parliament believes about the existence of God or of the sanctity and obligation of an oath.

2. That it is bigotry to require of any man a profession of belief in God as a condition to taking his seat in the House of Commons.

3. That election by a majority of any constituency constitutes the sole condition required for sitting in Parliament.

4. That as Mr. Bradlaugh was willing to take the oath the House was bound to receive it.

5. That Mr. Gladstone is correct in affirming that Mr. Bradlaugh has been deprived of his *legal* right to sit in the House.

6. That Sir Stafford Northcote and his followers, by their bigoted and inquisitorial intolerance, have led the House into this undignified conflict, out of which there is now no way of escape except by either letting Mr. Bradlaugh come to the table and take the oath, or by altering the law to include the case of those who believe neither the existence of God nor the sanctity of an oath.

Now, I believe these allegations to be all and severally false and dangerous to the commonwealth, and the reasons of my belief I will give as briefly as possible.

1. There was no inquisition as to Mr. Bradlaugh's private belief or unbelief. He had paraded it for years over the country. He had not been permitted to swear in a court of law when he offered to do so. He forced the knowledge of his unbelief upon the House of Commons by his own explicit declaration. There is no parallel between this paraded unbelief and the secret scepticism, or even infidelity, which may lie hid in the silence of other men. Such unbelief, for the most part, is not disbelief, but a negative and hesitating doubt which neither believes nor disbelieves. Such men take the oath; no man asks, or has a right to ask, as to their inward thoughts. They obtrude them on no man, and no man has authority to search their hearts. Even the law has no such authority; *de internis non judicat lex.* What likeness has all this to Mr. Bradlaugh's dogmatising infidelity, the literature of which

has for years revolted the moral sense of the country before he forced it on the knowledge of the House of Commons?

2. Where, then, is the bigotry of refusing to allow a man who publicly denies the existence of God and the sanctity of an oath to kiss the Word of God, as *the law of England explicitly holds it to be*, and to make an oath which he believes to be not a form merely, but a farce? To co-operate materially or morally in such profanation would make the House of Commons a partaker in the act. To look on while it was perpetrated, and both to tender and to receive such an oath—and it is the House that does both these things—would be a direct material and moral co-operation in an act which would be only not perjury because it would also be blasphemy. If it be bigotry in the House of Commons to refuse to allow this, much more to share in this outrage on truth and conscience, the moral world must have been lately turned upside down.

3. They who affirm that Mr. Bradlaugh has a legal right to take his seat tacitly assume that the sole condition for sitting in the House of Commons is election by a constituency. This assumption is directly at variance with the law of England. The statute law requires of the elected that he should either swear or affirm. Mr. Bradlaugh could not make the affirmation, because none but Quakers and Moravians are admitted to do so. He could not swear, because by his previous declarations he had made himself incompetent to take an oath. He, therefore, could not fulfil the conditions of the statute law, which are two, and not one only—

namely, election, and the oath or affirmation. The House of Commons has no power to tender or to receive the Parliamentary oath as if it were a nullity.

4. Further, this answers the pretence, that as Mr. Bradlaugh was willing to make the oath, the House was bound to receive it. The House is bound, indeed, to receive the oath; but Mr. Bradlaugh's declaration in the House, as well as out of it, destroyed the oath. His act was no oath; and the law which binds the House to receive the oath binds the House also not to receive that which is no oath. And here I cannot but express my wonder at the hesitation, unless the report be erroneous, of the Attorney-General to declare that Mr. Bradlaugh's parody of the oath was no oath and of no effect. An oath is an obligation imposed by one party upon another. The House is the administrator or imponent; the member assents, and assenting makes the oath. The imponent receives the oath so made. Who tendered or imposed the oath on Mr. Bradlaugh? The House had long ago refused either to tender or to accept his oath. The whole act was an outrage in morals and null in law.

5. This being so, it passes my comprehension how it can be said that Mr. Bradlaugh is deprived of his legal right. He has no such right until he has fulfilled the conditions of the statute law. And he has created his own incompetency to fulfil it. All through these discussions it has been assumed that election, and election only, is the sole condition for sitting in Parliament. Such is not the law of the land.

6. The direct and inevitable conclusion is that Sir

Stafford Northcote and those who have supported him have been defending two things sacred to Englishmen —the one, the law of the land; the other, the foundation of all law: that is, the religion of nature and the natural moral law, the existence of God and His moral attributes, which are written on the conscience of mankind.

They have been defending the law of the land, for by that law no elected member can sit in the House of Commons without the further condition or qualification of making the oath or the affirmation. Mr. Bradlaugh can make neither: legally, he cannot make the affirmation; and, morally and legally, he cannot make the oath.

By the law of England at this moment, the propagation of atheism is an indictable offence; by the law of England, therefore, the existence of God is affirmed. The Legislature has never yet departed from this broad base of the civil order and social life of man. It has admitted an affirmation for those who so profoundly believe in God that they fear to offend Him by swearing in the form of an oath. It has admitted the Jewish race, whose whole existence rests upon the belief in God. It has never inquisitorially dived into the hearts or intellects of men who, responsible to their own conscience, fulfil the conditions of the law. Beyond this it has never gone; and without departing from all its traditions and shifting its base, not only from the rock to the sand, but from the rock to the quicksand, it can never go. But it is this that we are invited now to do; and we are invited to do it

expressly and explicitly for the relief of the tender consciences of those who do not believe in the existence of God. They do not believe in your oath, therefore you must alter it.

We answer we will not change our whole moral life for the sake of those who will not believe. Let them look to themselves. They must rise to the commonwealth. The commonwealth will not lower itself to them. To do this would be not only to condone, but to recognise atheism by law. We are invited to do this, forsooth, on the principles of religious liberty. We are denounced for refusing to do this on the score of bigotry. Then religious liberty is the liberty to have no religion. Is, then, to deny the existence of God a religious creed, and one among the religions of the world? Comte taught us that society cannot exist without religion, nor religion without a worship, nor worship without an object. But as there is no God, the object must be created: and he created the abstract idea of humanity, and bid us fall down before it. The commonwealth of England has not as yet opened its gates to these intellectual aberrations. Our laws rest upon the belief of a Supreme Lawgiver, on whose justice all just laws repose, and by whose will all laws are controlled and tested. So long as they are conformed to that supreme legislation, they are just; if by a hair's breadth they deviate from it, they are so far null and of no obligation. Bracton says "the king himself ought not to be subject to man, but subject to God and to the law; for the law makes the king;" "for a king can do nothing on the earth—since

he is the minister and vicar of God—except that which he may do of right."

Such is the law of the land. We are asked to declare that the law knows nothing of God, nor of an eternal law; that human laws rest on the human will alone, and human society rests on itself—that is, on man without God. Its foundation is the abyss. The Parliamentary oath is in this true and ancient sense, if men so please to call it, a religious test; but it is no new test, no new bigotry. It is the tradition of our ancient jurisprudence: the witness of our dependence upon a judgment and a justice which are supreme. I say this is the law of the land at this moment. And our whole history—Saxon, Norman, English, Catholic, non-Catholic—would prove it by an exuberance of evidence. But I will take one only proof. We are invited to change the law. The law itself is a witness for the existence of God, and you want to efface that witness. This we refuse absolutely and altogether. *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.* If you want to change them you must overwhelm us. By argument you never will, without being forced to accept the last extremities of atheistic politics. You may overwhelm us by numbers and tumult, and the turbulence of the people misled by a despotic Liberalism. They, therefore, who have broken from party ties, to resist the desecration not only of an oath but of our whole legislation, have been standing for the defence of the law of the land.

But they have been doing more than this. They have been standing in defence of the foundation of all law; for there can be no political order among men

without a moral law, and there can be no moral law without a recognition of the personal relations between God and man, and man and man. From these relations all laws and obligations spring. When we are told that this is a violation of constitutional and religious liberty, we answer, constitutional liberty is not legislation without morals, and religious liberty is not the equalisation of Theism and atheism. If the public law of the Commonwealth be atheist, Theism is only tolerated; and if Theism be only tolerated, atheism is supreme. The law would know no God; and the Commonwealth, resting on that law, would rest on the belief in God no longer.

I do not believe for a moment that the people of England, Scotland, and Ireland are prepared for this apostasy. I believe the religious sense of the country would indignantly repel this national effacement of God from its laws and its life. We are not yet ripe for decrees to abolish or to restore the *Etre Suprême*. And what the people of the United Kingdom would not do must not be done by a side-vote, or by a resolution, or by a party majority, on which the country has had no opportunity for declaring its will. No Government, without violence to the conscience of the great majority of the people, could propose in this Parliament such a change of the law. They ought to dissolve and go to the country. If, after such an appeal, the people should decide that the commonwealth of England shall be shifted from belief in God and His laws to the dark and pathless wild of unbelief, the work and the responsibility will not be ours, but theirs who perpetrate it—which may God avert from us and from the future of our country!

VI.

PARLIAMENTARY OATHS.

(*Nineteenth Century.*)

PARLIAMENTARY OATHS.

Whatever comes from Lord Sherbrooke, by speech or by writing, is sure to be sharper than a two-edged sword. But a sword with two edges may be fatal to the hand that wields it. So it seems here. The paper on Parliamentary Oaths in the last number of this Review, by proving too much, proves our contention.

In the seven pages of his article I had marked fifteen passages open to criticism; but to avoid prolixity I will endeavour to give only the premisses of Lord Sherbrooke's argument. The premisses contain the whole argument. He opposes not only all oaths Parliamentary and forensic, but all affirmations of allegiance, as superfluous and unnecessary, on the ground that the duty of allegiance is already one of perfect obligation, and that no oath or promise can add obligation to that which perfectly obliges already.

Again, he argues, that, as all men are bound to speak the truth, the adding of an oath "really weakens that which it is intended to fortify."

Finally, that the words, "So help me God," and the like, are an "imprecation" or "invocation of a curse," which is "a presumptuous sin;" and that "it is a sin and a shame that any man should be put in

such a position, and not only allowed but encouraged to renounce the help of the Deity."

I believe that these are the only premisses or principles on which Lord Sherbrooke rests his case.

The conclusion is given in these words: "It seems to me to follow from these considerations that we ought to go back to the precept which declares that our conversation should be 'Yea, yea,' and 'Nay, nay;' and the duty of a citizen to tell the truth in a court of justice will be best enforced by treating it as an obligation which every citizen is bound to perform without any contract, oath, or promise, but subject to severe punishment if he violates or evades it."

1. The article begins on Parliamentary oaths, but it ends only on forensic oaths, for I do not suppose that Lord Sherbrooke proposes to subject members of Parliament "to severe punishment" for their legislative acts. To my mind, this betrays the whole argument. Even the citizen in a court of law is not here left to his sense of "perfect obligation." He has "severe punishment" hanging over his head. The fear of eternal punishment is supposed to be so low in men that the fear of severe temporal punishment is necessary to get at the truth. No contracts, oaths, promises, declarations, then, without this will get at the truth. But there is a lingering hope that the fear of "severe punishment" may. These are not the principles or the belief of those who maintain that oaths are lawful, useful, and even morally necessary. I will, suppose then, that this severe punishment has effect upon those who have no belief in God or no fear of God. Over

such men there is but one hold: the fear of "severe punishment." But there are, happily, some men who believe in God and fear Him. With such men an oath, or an affirmation, which is equivalent to an oath in obligation, though not in form, adds another and higher motive than the fear of any punishment by human law. Two such motives are at least stronger than one.

But it is argued that with men who believe in God such oaths are superfluous, because they will do for conscience, without an oath, the duty to which conscience without any oath already binds them. This is assuredly a hasty and narrow estimate of men in general. Between those whom no oath can bind, and those who, without an oath, will always speak the truth, there is a multitude that no man can number who are vehemently tempted, interested, and influenced by a multiplicity of persons, events, circumstances, to shrink from the full and perfect declaration of truth, and even to deny it. To say that the gravity and solemnity of taking an oath has no effect upon such persons, or that they would without an oath be as truthful and exact as when sworn on oath, seems to me to contradict the *communis sensus* of mankind, which in all ages and in all lands has testified two things—the one, that men ought to be truthful without oaths, the other, that men are not so. The difference of value in evidence taken on oath and evidence given without oath is well known not only to lawyers, but to others whose office is at times judicial. I have had abundant proof of it in the office I hold, which compels me to find the truth, if I can, in many grave affairs; and yet I am hindered by

the law of the land from administering an oath to any witness.

2. And here I cannot but feel surprise that the form of words "So help me God" should seem to be "a presumptuous sin" in those who take it, and a "sin and shame" in those who exact it. Lord Sherbrooke puts it thus: "It is, if the words be carefully considered, the renouncing of God's mercy, the invocation of a curse, the assumption that we know better than the Deity how He ought to treat us, that we have the right and the power to direct what that treatment should be." If these words be true of "So help me God," are they not equally true of "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us"? But by this rule of interpretation we are saying every morning and night, "If I do not forgive others, do not forgive me." Is this also a renouncing of God's mercy, and an invocation of a curse, an assumption that we know how we ought to be treated, and a direction that so we shall be? Either this also is a presumptuous sin, or Lord Sherbrooke's interpretation will not stand. As the Lord's Prayer came from the Saviour of the world, I must believe that the interpretation must be an error; or its rebuke would fall on Him Who taught us so to pray. *Lex credendi lex orandi.* Our belief is the rule of our prayer, and our prayer of our belief. "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive others" is a confession of the justice of God, a submission to the equity of His law, a resolution of obedience to its perfect obligation, and a prayer for strength to be "perfect as our Father Who is in heaven is per-

fect;" that is, to act to all as we pray God to act to us. The words "So help me God" are likewise an acknowledgment of all these truths in their relation to the duty of bearing witness to the truth. That a population which daily says the Lord's Prayer, is incapable of understanding the words "So help me God" surpasses my belief. To tell us that the English people do not say or do not understand the Lord's Prayer is to say that they are without the knowledge of God. If that be so, I answer, do not abolish oaths, but instruct the people. Again, I must repeat, *homo sine cognitione Dei pecus*, "Men without the knowledge of God are cattle." I will not believe that the English people are cattle. They are not sunk so low. I must rather believe that a handful of speculative jurists and sceptical politicians have imposed their theories upon us "while men slept." We have waked up to find the forensic oath already half gone, and the Parliamentary oath on the verge of abolition. And all this without appeal to the people of England. But when I say instruct the people, I mean educate them with the education of their forefathers. The people of England are a Christian people, because their education till 1870 was Christian. An education which excludes Christianity from our schools will rear a people that will abolish not oaths only, but the Lord's Prayer, and much more besides. The politicians who say "The people have sunk so low that we must abolish the recognition of God from our courts and Parliament," are dooming the people never to rise again. This is not the language of patriotism or of Christianity; and

cannot yet believe that patriotism and Christianity have ceased to reign over the people of England.

3. Lord Sherbrooke does not show his usual precision in the following description of Lord Redesdale's Bill. "The object was, not to provide the Sovereign with true and faithful servants, but to surround her with orthodox divines." I am inclined to think that Lord Redesdale would make short work of the first proposition; and on the second, perhaps, he would agree with me in believing that true and faithful servants are most surely to be found among those who believe in a Supreme Lawgiver, and in their own responsibility to Him. Such men gladly acknowledge their duty to Him as the highest obligation which binds them to their Sovereign. Such men may be assailed by all the temptations common to man; they may be ambitious, covetous, false, but they are conscious of something more than an obligation arising from the civil duties of citizenship or of personal loyalty. Their allegiance as "true and faithful servants" has a twofold sanction. They have not yet got beyond the two precepts of the Divine and of the natural law: "Fear God, honour the the King." I cannot believe that the sense of obligation is "perfect" in the conscience of any man who rests his allegiance only on the natural law. It may bind by all the sanctions of honour and human fidelity; but these are not perfect until they are elevated and invested with a higher and more sacred responsibility, by a recognition of the Lawgiver from Whom these duties flow, and to Whom they bind the conscience and its acts. Lord Redesdale would then certainly answer:

"It is because I desire to surround the Sovereign with true and faithful servants, that I desire to ascertain what manner of men they are. If they are men who believe in no Supreme Lawgiver, and have no consciousness of a responsibility beyond this life, in which all manner of infidelity, both of head and heart, may be cloaked under the sheep's clothing of 'true and faithful servants,' I desire that the Sovereign should never be surrounded by such as they. And if I find that the words 'So help me God' will keep off one of them, I will retain the words." If there be men so dead to honour, truth, and conscience as to say "So help me God," without belief in Him, they are outside the moral law. The great majority of Englishmen believe in God, in His law, in conscience, and in judgment to come. They say "So help me God" with full belief in His justice and in His mercy, and with full intention to be faithful to Him and to their Sovereign; and by these words they resolve and record their resolution of fidelity. These words are neither "execration" nor "imprecation," but a sincere and simple witness of faith in God. I shall have to return on this path hereafter, and, therefore, leave it for the moment. If Lord Sherbrooke is not felicitous in saying what Lord Redesdale's Bill was not, he is hardly happier in saying what it is. It assuredly was not intended to surround the Sovereign "with orthodox divines." Somebody said the other day that "So help me God" might be said by a Mohammedan. Why not? The Mohammedan world is a rebuke to the men who tell us that God is not knowable. The "oath" may be taken by all who

believe that God is, and that he is our Lawgiver and will be our Judge.

The Queen of England and Empress of India is surrounded by some two hundred and fifty millions of "orthodox divines." All her Christian, all her Catholic, all her Jewish, all her Mohammedan, perhaps even all her Hindoo subjects, all they, too, who, rejecting all revelation, yet believe in the lights and laws of natural religion, all these alike might, as theists, have made Lord Redesdale's declaration. If this be orthodoxy and divinity, then the Queen has even more theological subjects than the Pope.

4. I can hardly believe Lord Sherbrooke to be serious when he adds that to require a belief in the existence of God is "a test which might include the rudest savage and exclude the subtlest metaphysician. The man who worships an animal, a star, a mountain, or a stream, would satisfy this remarkable test." We must have "a perfectly clear and logical statement of what is intended when we use the word God." The whole race of Israel, the whole Mohammedan, the whole Christian world believes and understands by the name of God a Supreme and Eternal Lawgiver Whom we are bound to obey, by Whom also we shall be judged. This is clear enough, and, if coherence be logical, it is also logical. And this conception of God is clear to a child without logic, and logical as well as clear to the intellect of reasoning men. It may be transcendent and surpassing comprehension, but it can be apprehended with perfect clearness; and if it be doubted by a handful, it is understood by the millions of mankind. It is in this sense that the oaths

of our Legislature and of our tribunals have come down from our forefathers. They would not have tendered these oaths to the worshippers of an animal, a star, a mountain, or a stream. In the making of England they were tendered, not by pagan Saxons to pagan Saxons, but by Saxon Christians to Christian England. The common sense of mankind had not yet been pollarded by Positivists nor paralysed by Agnostics. We have gradually admitted to take these oaths of allegiance all who are Christian, or Jew, or even Theist by the light of nature. We have never yet betrayed the foundations of all moral life, personal, private, domestic, public, by effacing the name of God from our laws; and that because the man who has ceased to believe, and therefore to live, in subjection to God and His law places himself outside of the society of men. He has put off not only orthodoxy and divinity, but morality and the common nature by which men can trust each other. These are strong words, and if I cannot justify them I will retract them. There are only two conditions of human life and action: the one in which, believing in God, a man's intelligence depends upon the Divine intelligence for his primary knowledge of truth, and his conscience depends upon the Divine will for the primary knowledge of right and wrong. The other condition is that in which a man, rejecting belief in God, erects his own intelligence into the test of truth and falsehood, and his own will into the rule of right and wrong. There is no third state. In a word, either God is our Lawgiver, or we make law for ourselves; either His will is our law, or our own will is

law to us, and makes law as it wills. I deny that this is Divine law, or natural law, or in any sense law at all. It is not divine morality nor natural morality, nor in any sense morality. "Independent morality," that is, morality which does not descend from the immutable perfections of God, has no basis but in the nature of man, which has already sanctioned polygamy, the exposure of infant life, suicide, the lawfulness of atheism, and much more besides. To this intellectual and moral anarchy the stream of the world is steadily descending. The nations are becoming turbulent because men are becoming lawless. All authority is weakening everywhere; parental, political, religious authority is growing feebler every day. The collective will of nations is shaking off all rule, because men one by one are breaking away from all law except their own will. To all such the words "So help me God" are no doubt a provocation, and an oath a contemptible superstition, a form which does not bind the conscience. Why? What conscience is there left in such men? And by what hold, or bond, or obligation will you bind what they call conscience? How can you take security that they are "true and faithful servants of their Sovereign"? There is no security left; the moral nature is confounded; and, as after the confusion of tongues men could not understand each other's speech, so, if there be no Divine law one and the same everywhere, and always binding all consciences alike, men cannot trust each other; but without mutual trust men cannot unite in civil life. Where the conscience of man does not reflect the law of a Supreme Ruler, society is

impossible. In a word, worn by repetition, "Without God the society of mankind cannot exist."

5. But I am aware that the inclination to abolish all oaths is to be found not only in such men as I have described, but in some of the higher and nobler minds among us. They are so revolted by the profanation of oaths and so perplexed by the practical intricacies of the question, that they are ready to get rid of it at once by abolishing oaths altogether. Their higher and nobler nature tells them that without any oath they would tell the truth, and without any affirmation they would be true and faithful servants of their Sovereign. They say, "If so with me, why not with all men?" I must believe that this is not deep thinking. In the construction of a ship bolts are necessary. The taking away of one bolt is not a question of one bolt more or less: it weakens and endangers the whole structure. The recognition of the existence of God and of His law, and of man's responsibility to Him, contained in an oath, pervades the whole structure of the private and public life of society. This has been true from the beginning of human history. Even they who denounce and deride Theocracy cannot deny that this recognition of God and His law has created the Christian world. Everything is sustained by the principle from which it springs. The Christian world can only be sustained by the maintenance of Christian faith. Even natural society cannot be sustained but by the maintenance of natural religion. We desire to maintain these things; and we refuse to draw even a bolt which holds its compact structure together. You desire to undo these things,

and therefore you have been knowingly drawing the bolts one after another. Or you do not know what you are doing: but to rid yourself of an embarrassment you are joining in the wreck of what you say you count dear and sacred. I have been arguing as if it were a question of the Christian world. It is so no longer. The commonwealth of England is Catholic, Christian, and Jewish. It is no longer any one of these exclusively, but it is still emphatically theist. It rests upon a belief in God, upon the law of God; and it is bound together by recognition of God as the Fountain of all law and the Judge of all men, Sovereign and subject alike. From this sacred structure—for even the order of nature is sacred, being the primary creation of God—not another bolt ought to be drawn till the people of England, Ireland, and Scotland by public election shall have spoken. A people is the arbiter of its own destiny. If it be found faithful, God, whom some would banish or ignore, will confirm its solid strength; if it be found faithless, it will pass sentence on itself, and He whom it has rejected may perhaps reject it likewise. Every "enabling Act of Parliament," whereby those who refuse to recognise God and His laws shall be admitted to make laws for us, is nothing less than a covert exclusion of God from the counsels and commonweal of England. A few men will do this thing, consciously knowing what they do; a multitude will do it unconsciously, not knowing and not seeing until too late that they have been used to destroy our ancient and sacred commonwealth, for which many would rather give their lives.

VII.

WITHOUT GOD, NO COMMONWEALTH.

(Contemporary Review.)

WITHOUT GOD, NO COMMONWEALTH.

I WILL set down, as briefly as I can, the meaning and reasons for the proposition I here affirm—namely, "that the social and civil commonwealth of mankind had its origin, and still has its perpetuity, in the knowledge of God, and in obedience to Him springing from that knowledge," so that without God no commonwealth is possible. If this can be shown to be true, it follows that the theory now so easily and commonly accepted—namely, that religion and politics ought to be separated; that between Church and State there ought to be no union; that the State in its origin and action is secular, that it has neither religion nor religious duties; that religion must be left to individuals as a matter between each several man and God, or at most ought to be treated by Churches, or communions, or voluntary associations of such individuals; that the abolition of oaths, judicial and Parliamentary, has no bearing on religion; and that the effacing of the Name of God from the public acts of the State would even tend to the promotion of Christianity—that all this cannot stand. All this rests upon the theory that the State has no relation to God. Such is the teaching of such writers as Comte, Buckle, and Macaulay. But this theory is contrary to the belief of the Old World, and, until the last generations, to the

faith of the New. It is at variance with the experience of mankind, and in direct opposition to the order which God has constituted both by nature and by revelation.

I say by nature and by revelation, because, though I am conscious that I am dealing with many who deny all revelation, I am dealing also with more who profoundly believe in it; because some who deny the facts of revelation will not, or cannot, deny the facts of nature; and, lastly, because I cannot consent to argue this question as if God were already not only deposed from His Sovereignty but also outlawed from His own world, which He, and not our politicians and philosophers, has made.

1. I will begin, then, by defining the terms of the proposition, that without God no commonwealth is possible. By commonwealth I mean a condition in which men are bound together, and protected by laws, for their common welfare. By civil life I mean the public life of men, as united in cities, or confederations of cities, or in nations. By social life I mean the private life of such cities or nations, in all their voluntary commerce and intercourse external to the civil law, as between families and families, or between the several members of the same family. By political I mean also civil, its Latin equivalent. When a cedar of Lebanon shall rise to its stature and spread its branches without a root, then such a commonwealth may arise and endure without a root. The civil and social relations of men imply duties and obligations to each other, and these spring from, and are enforced by, law. But law must also spring from a root which is immutable, or there can be

no common obligation; and this common obligation must have a sanction to enforce it higher than the halter of the hangman, and more imperative in conviction and persuasion than any Act of Parliament. What, then, is this root, and where is it planted?

2. The root of the commonwealth is in the homes of the people. The civil and social life springs from, and is controlled by, the domestic life of mankind. There are three imperishable relations in human life—authority, obedience, and brotherhood. When the first son of man was born into the world, authority and obedience, which were latent, unfolded themselves into vigour; when a second was born, brotherhood, with all its equities, was constituted for ever. And these three relations were not the result of original compact, or of enactments of men, but are inseparable from the order of human life, and intrinsically contained in the essence and structure of the human family. Authority, obedience, and brotherhood are the three ultimate and all-sufficing laws of the human commonwealth. Equality, liberty, and fraternity are the parody and perversion of this divine order. Authority is, therefore, founded not in the human will, but in the nature of man; obedience is an obligation not created by man for himself, but imposed upon him. Brotherhood is a natural law which binds all men to do to others as they would be done by; to render to every man his due; and in mutual benevolence, when needed, to go beyond it. If any man shall say that these relations, obligations, and duties are of human creation, or that they are enactments of the human will, I will not dispute with him, except by

saying that I could as soon believe the law of gravitation, or the ebb and flow of the tide, to be by human legislation. It is to be noted that they who deny to these primary laws a foundation in nature, are precisely those who maintain the parody of equality, liberty, and fraternity, which, as I hope to show, is a denial of all law except the license of the will of man.

3. There can only be conceived two fountains of law. It springs either from the will of God, or from the will of man; and this inevitable alternative we will examine, so far as we can in so narrow a space. If the primary laws of the human family be from nature, they are from God; and all human society—domestic, social, civil—springs from God, and has its coherence and perpetuity from God. The root of all commonwealth is, then, planted in the will of God. Therefore even the heathen world was nearer the truth when it venerated a *Dea Roma*, than they who deny the natural or Divine law as the foundation of human society. For if these primary laws be only from man, they have no sanction higher than human coercion to enforce them, and no intrinsic obligation over the conscience or will of man. They would be only penal laws, which men of their free choice might disobey and risk the penalty. Then there could exist no commonwealth, because no common law of higher authority than the will of man. Such an aggregate of men can be called a State only by courtesy. It is an inorganic and unsocial multitude.

4. Let us first take the hypothesis that the primary laws of the human family are not from man but from Nature—that is, from God.

There does not exist, so far as I know, in the history of the world any commonwealth in which these laws of domestic life are not treated as Divine. Take the Hebrew Commonwealth simply as a secular history. Compare with it the domestic, social, civil life of the Greek or Roman world. With all the relaxations of divorce, and all the severities of its penal code, the Commonwealth of Israel was in justice, equity, mercy, moral purity, and rectitude as high above the highest civilisation of Athens or Rome, as it was below the Christian Society which has been grafted upon it. What, then, was the foundation of that Commonwealth but the recognition of the laws of nature as the laws of God, and of God as the Supreme Lawgiver and Judge of men?

But even the Greek and Roman world as distinctly and precisely recognised these primary laws of human society to be Divine. Every hearth in Greece was sacred to *Hestia*, and the fire that burned upon it was the emblem of the purity of domestic life. Every hearth therefore was a domestic altar. *Hestia* was partaker in the honours paid at every shrine. In the *Prytaneia* of the cities, where the sacred fire was kept for ever burning, *Hestia* had a share—for a commonwealth is but an organic aggregate of homes; and as the order and relations of home were sacred, so were the order and relations of the commonwealth.

So also in the Roman world. The fire on the hearth was sacred. *Hestia*, or *Vesta*, the Divine Guardian of the sanctities and purities of home, was the lawgiver of domestic life. The sacred fire burned perpetually in

the *Regia*, which was the hearthstone of the Commonwealth. I refrain from saying, what everybody knows, that the recognition of Divine power and law and government in the old world was so profuse that the whole private and public life of man was enveloped in it. The pantheism of the educated, and the polytheism of the people, both alike prove all that I am contending for. The old world believed the primary laws of human society to be Divine; and that a supreme God, the Lawgiver and Judge, presided over all the private and public life of man. They recognised their responsibility to Him; they bound themselves to Him by vows and by promises; they also bound themselves to each other by oaths, of which He was the witness, and, if violated, the avenger. *Dea Roma* had a sanctuary, surrounded by four hundred and twenty temples; and in every city of the empire *Dea Roma* had a shrine. If any man shall say that the Hebrew Commonwealth would have been as just, equitable, merciful, and enduring without the knowledge of God and of His laws, and without a conscious relation to Him as their Lawgiver and Judge, I may be silent. Such words need no answer. If any man shall say that the Greek and Roman world would not have corrupted with greater speed and intensity if the sacredness of the home and of the State had not been recognised; or that Athens or Rome would have been no less pure and moral in its private life, and as upright and just in its public life of commerce and legislation, if it had recognised no divine laws, no divine presence, no divine Judge, no divine sanctions,

no obligation in an oath—I can only point to the history of the world, and hold my peace.

5. Now I have confined my notice of the old world to the two centres of its life: the sacredness of the home, and the sacredness of the commonwealth. The notion of a home without a divine protector, or of a State without a divine lawgiver, is not to be found in the old world. Nor is it to be found in the modern world. The Greek and Roman civilisation passed away by the law of its own corruption. It died a natural death, and was buried. The civilisation of the Christian world is not the continuity of an older civilisation patched up and purified. It is a new creation, springing from a new principle of life and order. The Christian world is the offspring of Christian homes; and Christian homes were created by the law and grace of Christian marriage. The laws and relations of the natural home, the authority of parents, the obedience of children, the brotherhood of sons, were confirmed by a higher sanction and invested with a deeper meaning. If there be anything sacred upon earth, it is a Christian home. The fire upon its hearth is holy. The first foundations of the Christian world were laid in households; and the social and civil life of Christendom is the expansion of its domestic life, as its domestic life is the collective life of men bound together by laws more perfect than the law of Nature. The Christian law says to children, "Obey your parents;"[1] and to subjects, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers,[2] for there is no power but from God." I still

[1] Col. iii. 20. [2] Rom. xiii. 1.

confine the subject to the same two points, the home and the commonwealth; and I affirm that both, by the law and order of Nature, and by the law and order of the Christian world, are sacred. They have their origin, their order, and their perpetuity from God. It may be said of homes and commonwealths as of men one by one—in Him "we live, and move, and are."

6. For clearness' sake I have confined our thoughts thus far to these two points; but they contain the whole subject of the civil order of mankind.

Towards those who deny the existence of a Creator, I have no further duty until they have made up their mind to say whether mankind is created, uncreated, or self-created. Until they have written down their proposition, we may go on with those who honestly acknowledge that man has a Creator. In the creation of man, both the family and the State were virtually contained; and in these the three relations of authority, obedience, and brotherhood are inherent. Authority, then, is not the creation of man or by the compact of men. It is antecedent to all social and civil states, and is itself of divine ordinance. In like manner, obedience is not of human origin or of human choice. It springs from a relation of the natural order, but the natural order is divine, for its author is God. Brotherhood, the nearest approach to equality—though it is not equality, but in gradations of inequality in age and maturity—is also of the divine order. And as in the family, so in the Commonwealth. The whole structure of society is pervaded by the will and power of God.

Without authority, obedience, and brotherhood, no society can exist.

7. As to authority, the old world profusely believed that its origin was from a divine source. The changes of dynasties, and successions, and forms of government by kings, or consuls, or dictators, or emperors, did not create authority. They were no more than the designation or election of the persons who should be invested with authority. But authority in itself was imperishable and independent of the will of men. Conquest does not create authority. It is only a sanguinary investiture of the person who shall bear the authority. God gives authority *immediately* to the society of men; and He gives it *mediately* through society to the person or persons whom society may select to wield it. The theory of compacts and conventions is of recent and revolutionary origin. It is a mutilation of the truth. It suppresses the *formal* authority of the ruler when once elected, and it exaggerates the power of society, which, though authority *materially* resides in it, is incapable of exercising it by any direct action beyond the act of designating the person of the Ruler.

8. And as with authority, so with obedience. The *Potestas patria* was a sovereignty extending to the power of life and death. Will any man say that any human authority could bind men to obey such a power? The civil ruler, from the beginning of the world, as known in history, has wielded the undisputed power of life and death, and men have both obeyed and executed his decrees, or without denial of his authority have

undergone his sentence. Now no men, except fathers and rulers, have authority to extort obedience from others. Slavery is defined in canon law as a violation of the law of nature. Except filial obedience and civil obedience—that is, in the home and the State—there is no obedience except by voluntary consent or contract between man and man. And this twofold obedience springs from one root, and has one and the same sanction, and is in its essence of divine ordination.

9. What is true of authority and of obedience is true also of brotherhood. Among the sons of a family there is equality and inequality. But the inequality is evanescent, and has in it no subjection of the younger to the elder. In all the liberties and rights of man the sons of a house are equal. In endowments of body and mind, and in the possessions and privileges of life, they may become unequal, and the younger may outstrip the elder; but before the law, both natural and divine, they are equal. This equality of man has been outraged from the beginning by fraud and by violence. It can exist only where obedience and authority are recognised as divine laws. Obedience and authority are the conditions of liberty, and liberty of equality.

These three relations were created in man, and are not of men, nor by men, but of God, the author of all order, law, and liberty.

10. And now I am prepared to hear an objector say, "You are assuming the existence of law, and nature, and God." I do assume these truths. I assume the existence of law in the moral world, as I assume it in the material world. I find that the same

soil, and the same rain, and the same sun, and the same air, from divers seeds will bring forth wheat and fruits, each in its kind differing in bulk, colour, texture, odour, and flavour. And I find the same phenomena uniform, universal, and perpetual. Every year the wheat in harvest is the same wheat, and the fruits in vintage and fruitage are the same fruits. And every seed and grain has a law of its own. No man willed it, and no man can repeal it. The laws of nature are indestructible. Uniformity, universality, and perpetuity are the sign and seal of a Lawgiver who is divine. Even the men of the old world could see this in the material universe, and they thought these laws to be deities. They could see it also in the moral world, and they recognised a law which man never made and man can never rescind. "There is not one law at Rome, another at Athens—one now, and another hereafter; but one law, perpetual and immutable, will bind together all nations and all time, of which the common Teacher and universal Ruler is God."[3]

What Cicero could say by the light of reason, another could more surely say by the light of faith. "Is it your will that we prove the existence of God from His own manifold and mighty works by which we are encompassed, sustained, and delighted, and also terrified? or shall we prove it from the witness of the soul itself, which, though it is straitened in the prison of the body, circumscribed by bad teaching, weakened by lusts and passions, surrounded by false gods, yet when once it comes to itself, as out of a surfeit, or a sleep, or a

[3] Cicero, *de Repub.* lib. iii.

sickness, and attains its health, it pronounces the name of God—by this name alone, because it is the proper name of the true God? 'Great God,' 'Good God,' 'May God grant it!'—this is the voice of all; and it calls on Him also as Judge, 'God sees,' 'To God I commend it.' 'God will repay.' O witness of the soul, Christian by nature!"[4] I will not believe that what Cicero could say to the pagans of Rome, and Tertullian to the heathen of Africa, I may not say to the Christians of England without being told that I beg the question.

11. The conclusion, then, that I would draw from all that I have said is this, that the domestic, social, and civil life of mankind, in homes, and nations, and commonwealths, is, by its origin, nature, laws, and duties, of divine creation: or, in other words, that the political society of men or the State is not a creation of man but of God. Let no one say that I affirm any particular form of state or government to be of divine institution. Forms may vary, but authority and obedience, and the relations and mutual duties of man with man, are of divine origin, imperishable and immutable.

Such was the political order of mankind shown in the history of the nations, before an event which has changed the face of the world, the foundation and expansion of the Christian Church and the creation of the Christian world. To this we must go on.

12. That the Christian Church claims, and is by the Christian world believed to be, the creation of a

[4] Tertullian, *Apolog.* xviii.

Divine Author, and to be governed by divine laws, is a historical fact, undeniable even by those who deny its claims to be divine. That it arose from a source of belief and of authority, external to the political state and civilisation of the old world, and maintained its independence of all civil authority, except in things of civil obligation, is undisputed by all, except those who have not read history. A new society appeared in the world, claiming to be divine in a sense higher, ampler, more direct than the original society of mankind. And this new society, though independent of the political order of the world, was in perfect harmony with it. The two societies had one and the same author ; all the primary laws of the first are also inscribed in the statute-book of the second. The second society was ordained to elevate, consolidate, and consecrate the first. Or in a word, the Church is ordained to fill up and to perfect the work of the State even in this world, and to guide man beyond this world to an eternal end.

13. These two societies, though distinct and designed for distinct ends, nevertheless reciprocally co-operate with each other. The primary end of the State is the material and moral welfare of men in this world, and it therefore in its moral action tends to the eternal welware which in itself it cannot bestow. The primary end of the Church is to bring men to their eternal welfare, and in aiming at this end it promotes also the material and moral welfare of mankind in this life. There can be no collision or opposition between these two societies, except so far as the members of the one

or the other are untrue to the laws of their office and their obligation.

14. In the first period of the Church, the collision was persecution on one side and patience on the other. Nevertheless the Church was a standing violation of the imperial laws. It was a *Societas illicita*, and if its existence had not been divine it ought not to have existed. It was a *Religio illicita*, and if its religion had not been the revelation of truth it ought not to have been practised. But the fault was not in the Church; it was in the civil power, and the fault was amended by the Empire in the day when the Decree of Milan was affixed to the columns of the Forum—*Christianam religionem profiteri liberum.*

15. From that time the divine law began to penetrate and to elevate the imperial law, until the leaven in the meal assimilated all that was just and true; and created a Christian empire and a Christian world. This is neither the time nor place to trace out the second period of the history of Christendom, when the two societies, civil and spiritual, were in amity and co-operation. I touch upon it only to affirm that the natural society of man, which existed outside of all revelation, Hebrew or Christian, in the Oriental, Greek, and Roman world, has ever been held to be, not the work and creation of human conventions or original contracts, but to be a divine order: for the order of nature is the work and creation of God. When, in the second period of Christian history, the political order was pervaded by the Christian law, it did not for the first time become religious. From the beginning of

time it has always had God for its author and the religion of nature for its worship, and the laws of nature for the rule of its legislation. Christianity bestowed upon it a perfection; and with the unction of truth, set a crown upon its head. *Dea Roma* became the mother of kingdoms, and the "kingdoms of the world became the kingdom of God and of His Christ."

16. And this brings us at last—after, I fear, a wearisome journey, with wheels driving heavily, for which I must ask the patience and pardon of any perchance who may read what I am writing—to the conclusion I desire to prove. I have asserted that God is the author and sustainer, the foundation and the coherence of the commonwealth of man; and as a consequence that without God no human commonwealth is possible. Without foundation or coherence, no house can stand. The whole domestic and political order of the world is bound together by religion; for religion is the bond which binds men to God and to each other. The very word is equivalent to obligation; and the twofold obligation of the reason and of the will of man to God as his lawgiver and judge, and to men in all the manifold relations of private and public life, holds together the members of families and of states. The public solemnities of divine worship are the recognition of the religion or bond which binds us to God and to each other. The mutual service of free will springs from the bond of charity. The sacredness of contracts, and oaths, and promises, all rests upon the obligations of religion. Without mutual confidence society would perish by fraud and violence; without mutual trust in

words and promises, no civil life could be knit together. The sanction of all morality, personal, domestic, political, is God, the present Witness and the future Judge, as the Roman law puts it, of false oaths, *Deus Vindex*. The last and only security a people can have for the justice of rulers and legislatures, is that they recognise a supreme law as their guide, and a supreme Lawgiver to whom they must give account. The issue of such a state of ordered legislation is the reign of law, the highest maturity of civilisation. But law can only reign over men whose conscience bears witness to the right of authority and the duty of obedience. Where law reigns coercion relaxes its hold, for the free will of the subject anticipates and asserts the just authority of rulers.

17. Let us reverse all that has been said. Let us suppose that the civil society of mankind is of human origin; that there is no sanction to enforce obedience to law but coercion and penalties; that there is no sanctity or obligation in oaths, no immutable law of right and wrong as the rule of legislation, no duties towards God, Who, perhaps, does not exist, or Who, if He exist, has no care or providence over men, and therefore of Whose existence the legislature and the State have no recognition, and need take no cognisance. By what moral obligation shall obedience be enforced to an authority which has no sanction above its own decrees, and no rule of right or wrong except either conventional usage or its own arbitary will? On what basis shall the credit, and commerce, and trust among men repose? and what motive is there to ensure fulfil-

ment to an unprofitable bargain, or fidelity to an inconvenient promise? Without a higher sanction and the cohesion of a moral law, the whole political order would be disintegrated, the whole social order would be dissolved, the whole domestic life would be confusion. Every house would be divided against itself, every commonwealth would fall asunder. As the moral forces of law, and right, and conscience, and mutual trust grow weaker, the material forces of coercion become stronger, authority without law becomes tyranny—the tyranny of one head, or, worst of all, the tyranny of many heads — that is, lawless democracy: not the popular government of self-governed men, but the conflict and clashing of turbulent masses, goaded by rival demagogues, and led by rival parties bidding for place by outbidding one another. In such a civil state there is no law, for there is no recognition of a legislator, no judge above the will of the many, or the self-will, the *liberum veto*, of each man for himself. The outcome of this is chaos, and the end is political and national suicide.

I can foresee that all this will be treated as exaggeration. It will be asked, "Do you believe all this will come out of such minor changes as the abolishing of a Parliamentary oath?" I believe that the starting of a bolt may sink a ship. I believe, too, that if the religious instincts of public men had not already long declined, the abolition of the Parliamentary oath would not for a moment be entertained. So many public recognitions of the Divine law have already been effaced, that the last remaining witness of a higher

moral sense is all the more to be maintained. It is bad enough to have the laws of the land broken by men who do not believe in God. It is worst of all to have the laws of the land made by a Legislature that effaces the name of God from its solemn obligations.

18. We have been told by a writer on civilisation, who once had his day, that as the actions of individual men are determined by the ends for which they act, so also the collective action of society is determined; and that as if we knew the ends for which men act we could foretell their actions, so in like manner we could foretell the action and the course of society. If, that is, we could know the cumulus of ends for which a society of men would act, we could prophesy its history. This is, indeed, a philosophy rather undeniable than deep.

We may, however, say that if we knew the principles which govern a man we can approximately foretell how he will act. A merciful man will act mercifully, a just man will act justly, a truthful man will act openly. So it may be said of a society, a nation, or a State. Collective morals are, however, for the most part perverted by the avarice, ambition, or passion of the majority. Still, we can confide, and foretell, from the character of a people, what its laws will be. There are certain immoral and impious laws in force in other countries which we can foretell, at least at present, that our Legislature will not consent to enact. There are certain laws enacted by our Legislature which the Chambers and Parliaments of other countries at this day refuse to enact. The plain reason of this is that the people of

England are Christian, and they would not allow anti-Christian legislation. So long, then, as a belief in God, in His law, in the immutable morality of right and wrong, in the sanctity of homes, in the obligation of oaths, in conscience, in responsibility, and in judgment to come, pervades and sustains the people of England, we can foretell the course of our Legislature, and we can confide in its acts.

19. But suppose a State or a Legislature composed of men who hold none of these principles of our moral nature, or who, if they hold them, hold them only as uncertainties, or opinions for their private life, not as governing laws of their public legislation; let us suppose an agnostic Parliament of unconscious, because uncultured, Epicureans, innocent of Lucretius, but believing in no Supreme Will or Law that guides the course of man and nations—who could foresee the ends for which they would deliberate? and who could foretell what laws such men would make? What should restrain such a Legislature from abolishing the legal observance of Christmas, of Good Friday, and of the Sunday; of rescinding all restraint on the employment of women and children in mines, factories, and poisonous trades, thereby destroying what remains of home-life among the poor? What shall hinder the multiplication of causes justifying divorce by the adoption of foreign and Oriental codes? What shall prevent the abolition of the Tables of Consanguinity and Affinity, and the reversal of the profound legislation by which the Christian Church has created and fenced the sanctity of Christian homes, thereby creating and constructing

the fabric of Christian civilisation and of Christian commonwealths? Why should not such a Legislature abolish all oaths of every kind, and in all judicial and legislative acts cease to remind men of a Divine Lawgiver Who is Witness of all their words and actions, and will be the Judge of their whole life at last? Why should it not recognise the inevitable presence and indulgence of all that is natural in man, and regulate its existence under protection of law? Why should it not revoke every gift which piety and charity has given for the service of God and the care of His poor—the *oblationes fidelium, et patrimonia pauperum*, as the Christian law of early days has it? Why not disestablish and disendow not the legal religion only, but the Free Churches which have inherited the gifts of their forefathers, and are handing them on with well-earned increment to their successors? Why should not a Parliament which has ceased to call God to witness to its fidelity, not only to an earthly Crown but to a Divine Lawgiver, abolish its chaplain, and cease to take its seat at prayers? Why not hold morning sittings on Sunday, and general elections on Sunday, and throw open not museums only, but theatres on Sunday? Why not legalise all labour and traffic, thereby adding a seventh of time and gain, as political economists have argued, to the national wealth? Why should it not abolish all laws against blasphemy? Has the Legislature any custody of the honour of God and His truth, when it has ceased to know Him as the source and sanction of its authority over men and the witness of its acts? Libel against men may be

punished, but libel against God hurts nobody. How can it hurt Him if He does not, or probably does not, exist?

When the statues of Hermes were mutilated in the night at Athens, the city was struck with horror. When Socrates was accused of atheism, he was condemned to henbane. If any man in Rome had extinguished the fire of Vesta, or profaned the Sanctuary of the *Regia*, the pontiffs would have inflicted fine, or even death. Both the Greek and the Roman world, immersed as they were in superstition, polytheism, pantheism, which, all of them, are the parasites of belief in a Divine Lawgiver, Ruler, and Awarder, were profoundly and profusely religious. A commonwealth or state without a Divine Lawgiver, law, and worship, in its private and public life, was a conception which, not to the Hebrew only, but to the Greek and Roman, was impossible to thought, and beyond the stretch of imagination. It has been reserved for these latter times. It is the delirium of men who, having known God, have turned their faces from Him. The theory that the recognition of God can be removed from the public Acts and Legislature of the Commonwealth is to strip the political order of mankind of its Divine character. It is to relegate religion to the private life of men, and to desecrate the public life of the State. Such a desecration no Christian ever imagined to be possible till the Lawless One should come, who shall exalt himself above all that is called God or worshipped. Even the Emperor in the days of persecution was *hominem a Deo secundum—solo Deo minorem*.[5]

20. The Commonwealth of England has indeed

[5] Tertullian, *ad Scapulam*, sect. 2.

been robbed of its first unity and perfection; but it has continued still to be profoundly Christian, and in admitting the theism of Israel within its precincts, it has in no way obscured its public recognition of God and its witness to His authority and laws. It rests not only on this Divine foundation, but upon another, which is also Divine; that is, upon the order and the religion, the lights and the laws of Nature, which also are the creation of God and the witness of his sovereignty.

In stripping the public life and action of our Commonwealth of the recognition of God, they who are doing it are not stripping off only the recognition of the God of the Old Testament and of the New, but of the God of Nature, and of His all-pervading presence in the public life of the empire. An empire without God cannot stand; for an empire which effaces God from its Legislature has no longer a principle of unity. It will, by a natural law of dissolution, return to the dust; it will sink lower than the old world; for an apostate world is lower than a superstitious world. It is better to have an altar to the Unknown God, than no altar and no God. Such a commonwealth has no foundation in the order either of Christian law or of natural law. It is lawless and descending—slowly, it may be imperceptibly, at first, but surely—and in another generation it will descend more swiftly and irresistibly into confusion. When the relations of authority, and obedience, and brotherhood, and the obligations which bind men to God and to each other, are stripped of their Divine sanction, the Commonwealth is death-struck; the vital warmth may linger for a while, but the life has fled.

VIII.

S. FRANCIS OF SALES.

(*Dublin Review.*)

S. FRANCIS OF SALES.

To show in any adequate measure the service rendered by Father Mackey in his excellent editions of the Letters of S. Francis of Sales, and of his golden Treatise on the Love of God, would require a longer and a more detailed review than we can give in the present short notice. In truth, to form a fair judgment of what we owe to him for his careful and instructive analysis of the Treatise on the Love of God, it is necessary to read and to weigh the valuable introduction prefixed to this edition. We can but indicate very briefly the reasons for believing that the publication of these volumes is very opportune at this time.

In his excellent introduction, Father Mackey has given a short account of the contention of Fénelon and Bossuet over the Treatise on the Love of God. Without doubt both misunderstood the words of S. Francis, and it would appear that neither of them had mastered, or perhaps could master, this wonderful work of the highest theology. Fénelon seems to have read it, not to learn, but to find a warrant for his own lofty but unguarded thoughts. Bossuet's intellect needed the *donum pietatis* to comprehend S. Francis. It would seem that they for a time rendered the work on the Love of God

suspect. The canonisation of the Saint was sufficient to dispel this mist, and the recent elevation of S. Francis to the dignity of a Doctor of the Church has lifted his writings from the level of a *nihil obstat* to the authority of a teacher in the Universal Church. When the Bishops of the Church, with the common consent of their flocks in all parts of the Church, were petitioning the Holy See to lay upon his head the *aureola* of Doctor, there were some who would have restrained this dignity to theologians in whom the gifts of science and of intellect are supreme, forgetting that the gifts of counsel and of wisdom are equally from the Holy Ghost, and that the great teachers of moral theology, as S. Alphonsus, and of mystical theology, as S. Francis of Sales, are equally created by the Spirit of Truth to be guides and teachers of the Church.

It has always seemed to us that as S. Charles was an offspring of the Council of Trent in the life of pastoral charity, so was also S. Francis in the law of liberty, which is the law of love written on the heart. The delusive and ghastly heresy of justification by imputed justice drew from the Fathers of that Council the luminous decree and definition which teaches that "we are truly called and are just" by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost and of charity, inasmuch as "by the Holy Ghost the charity of God is poured out in the hearts of those who are justified, and is inherent in them," because "Christ Jesus Himself flows into them as the head into the members, or as the vine into the branches." In this the Council of Trent gave an impulse which created the Saints of active charity: S.

Philip, S. Vincent, and the group of uncanonised but saintly men who renewed everywhere the heroic charity of the apostolic time. So also it fashioned the mind of S. Francis, and of the Visitation from which sprang the devotion of the Sacred Heart. It is indeed true that S. Augustin had a forecast of this special adoration of the Sacred Humanity; and S. Bernard, S. Bonaventure, and S. Bernadine all but defined it. S. Gertrude put it into words, praying to the "deified Heart." But the time was not yet come. It was reserved for a humble and despised daughter of the Visitation, a true disciple of the Treatise on the Love of God, to be chosen as the teacher of this profound devotion, which opens the mystery of the Incarnation and of the Most Holy Eucharist as with a flood of light alike to the theologian and to the little child. The Treatise on the Love of God might be well called the Greater Manual of the Sacred Heart, and S. Francis the prophet of its adoration. But in so regarding this treatise as a work of exalted piety, we must not fail to see, as Father Mackey has fully shown in his analysis of it, its strictly scientific and dogmatic character. The ministration and office of the Holy Ghost the Sanctifier; His indwelling and manifold operations of grace; the freedom and power of the regenerate will, are delineated and defined with the utmost doctrinal precision. It is a work of scholastic method and exactness: nevertheless it is a work of positive theology drawn from the Divine tradition of the Church, from Holy Scripture, and from the Fathers.

Father Mackey has very truly summed up the result

of the teaching of S. Francis in these words: "This view of life, this continual gazing on the beloved Master for whom we work, this regarding the acts of life as a mere series of acts or offerings of love, is the very central point of the ascetic teaching of S. Francis. It not only gives the nobleness, the intensity, the meritoriousness of charity to every act, but it gives also at the same time a great simplicity and largeness, preserving the soul from formality, and from getting lost or wearied in the multitudinous details and minute practices of the spiritual life. It creates a loving detachment and liberty of spirit, with a readiness to follow every slightest indication of God's will. . . . . Amongst all virtuous actions we should carefully practise those of religion and reverence to Divine things, those of faith, hope, and the most holy fear of God—often talking of heavenly things, thinking of and aspiring after eternity, frequenting churches and holy services, reading spiritual books, observing the ceremonies of the Christian religion; for holy love feeds at will amid these exercises, and spreads its graces and properties more abundantly over them than over the simple human virtues" (Book xi. 3). . . . "In little and low exercises charity is practised not only more frequently, but also, as a rule, more humbly, and therefore more profitably and more holily" (xii. 6). S. Francis shows that legitimate occupation even in court or camp do not hinder the practice of Divine love. He says it "is the silly, vain, superfluous undertakings with which we charge ourselves that turn us from the love of God, and not the true and lawful exercise of our

vocations" (xii. 4). This sound common sense is spiritual wisdom, speaking with the voice of Holy Scripture. It has the Divine simplicity of S. Paul teaching the Corinthians the law of charity, and of S. James teaching the Christian world the law of liberty. The spiritual world has its mechanics and its dynamics, as well as the physical. They cannot be put asunder; and neither can have its due effect without the other. But they are not equal in vitality. The great primeval power of spiritual life and perfection is the love of God. Without this all mechanics of human device are lifeless. With this the regenerate will becomes a law to itself. It anticipates all commandments and goes beyond all obligations, and by the free, spontaneous generosity of love it is always seeking to do more for the beloved Master and the Divine Friend. Other perfection than this the revelation of faith does not teach: nor has the Church of God ever known.

Father Mackey has not hastily put his hand to the editing and interpreting the writings of S. Francis. His four essays on the life and writings of the Saint have qualified him to speak with authority. He has diligently and conscientiously studied his text, and has patiently and with a judicious discernment of a translator's duty turned the antique and classical French of S. Francis into clear and faithful English. Every one who has endeavoured to read the old translation of Father Carr, or the modern translation of some unknown hand, will be able to appreciate the difficulty of the task and the great boon Father Mackey has given us in his excellent version. We earnestly commend

these volumes to all readers, and we desire their widest diffusion, as we desire also that the doctrine and spirit of S. Francis may reign in all our hearts, both of pastors and of people.

IX.

WILLIAM GEORGE WARD.

(*Dublin Review*, 1882.)

WILLIAM GEORGE WARD.

THE October number of the *Dublin Review* cannot go forth without bearing on its foremost page a record of the lamented death of Mr. William George Ward.

The loss we have sustained by this event has been sensibly and widely shared, not by Catholics only, but by a multitude of personal friends, and by men of the most various minds, to whom, as a man of letters, he was intimately known. The discerning and generous articles of the *Times* and other journals, of the *Spectator*, the *Saturday Review*, and other similar critics, prove how his genial and attractive character, his spotless integrity of life and his great intellectual powers, had impressed his literary contemporaries with a sense of eminent worth.

If such was the recognition of the general loss which we have all sustained, what must be our consciousness of privation and of diminished resource which has fallen on the *Dublin Review*? What it owed tc him during the sixteen years in which he was not only editor but chief contributor, and what aid even after he had ceased to conduct it he still gave by a constant series of philosophical writings, is well known. And yet the importance of his work is perhaps fully known only to a few who were in immediate contact with him

and with the *Dublin Review*. The great success of the first series of the *Dublin Review*, when it was sustained by the contributions of the illustrious group of men who surrounded the late Cardinal Wiseman in his early career, had, by the same order of time and nature by which we also are now deprived, begun to decline. In the year 1862 Cardinal Wiseman gave to me the legal proprietorship of the *Dublin Review* on the condition that I would insure its continuation. After certain preliminary endeavours, Mr. Ward accepted in full the responsibility of editor. He has stated that all articles passed under the judgment of three censors, who were charged to examine the bearing of them on faith, morals, and ecclesiastical prudence. From the time he undertook the office of editor he threw himself into it as the work and way in which as a layman he was to serve the Church. He devoted to it not only all his powers and studies, but large means for its support. It governed his time and his movements. He was wont to leave his home and to reside in London at the quarterly periods of publication. Everything gave way to the *Dublin Review*. His whole mind, ever active and watchful to note the intellectual needs and vicissitudes of Catholic opinion, found expression in its pages. Four times in every year, and in a wide field, he was able to speak. The fulness and energy of his mind and an unresting zeal for truth impelled him to be always on the alert in defending what is true, and in assailing what is at variance with the truth. This made it a necessity for him to have a ready outlet of his thoughts. Such during sixteen years was the

second series of the *Dublin Review*. Perhaps the only contemporaneous example of the all but identity of an editor with his periodical is *Brownson's Review*. In both cases the power of mind in the editor impressed a dominant character upon the work. This fact may have made the *Review* less interesting to general readers, but it greatly increased its intrinsic value. If the articles were wanting in the play and lightness and variety required by ordinary readers, they were solid, grave, and of enduring importance. The second series of the *Dublin Review* did not rank among literary magazines, but it fairly won and kept its place among the weightier and more serious quarterly periodicals.

Since Mr. Ward laid down the office of editor, he published two volumes of articles selected from his contributions to the *Review*. To the second of these, which is entitled "Essays on the Church's Doctrinal Authority," he prefixed a preliminary essay, which may be described as an intellectual history and analysis of the sixteen years of his editorship. He has traced very accurately the condition of opinion and the tendency of thought among Catholics before the year 1862, and the successive controversies in which he was involved down to the year 1873. The whole essay is a summing-up of his own words and acts, and a calm and candid justification of the whole polemical attitude in which he habitually lived. It is, happily, no longer necessary to specify the subjects of the successive conflicts. But the cause of his anxiety may be better given in his own words than in any words of mine. At the close of his essay he thus writes:

"I just now said that I do not think that there exists at this moment among English Catholics any such organised intellectual agitation as there was some sixteen years ago in favour of anti-Catholic doctrine. Yet they must always be exposed to considerable dangers of unconsciously imbibing such doctrine while they are circumstanced as at present. Such danger, I say, must always exist, so long as—instead of their living (as in olden time) under the Church's magisterial shelter—there exists that unreserved intercourse between them and non-Catholics which is an unhappy necessity of the time; and so long as they indulge the habit of freely and unsuspiciously familiarising themselves with non-Catholic literature, periodical or other. As the *Month* once happily expressed the matter, the 'surges are sometimes considerable which rock the vessels riding in security within the shelter of a land-locked harbour'—*i.e.* the Catholic Church—'while a violent storm rages without, fraught with danger to the rash and unfortunate mariners who are exposed to its fury on the open sea.' And very far more especially, more calamitously, will this be the case in regard to those vessels which do not avail themselves of the full shelter afforded by the innermost part of the harbour, but approach the extreme limit dividing it from the ocean itself. I think that, under the circumstances of modern society, it must always be important for Catholics to be familiar with much of the ground covered by the following essays, and this is one of my various reasons for republishing them. No doubt I must have incidentally made many serious mistakes in them,

both as regards theory, and, still more, the practical application of theory; though my conviction is certainly strong that the general principles which I have maintained are quite indubitably sound and Catholic. On all this, however, I unreservedly submit my own judgment to that of more learned and competent theologians. Even if there were far more of error in what I have written than I believe there to have been, still, I hope I may say without presumption that I am confident I have done a really important service, were it only by pressing the questions on the attention of my co-religionists.

"I must again express an apology to the reader for troubling him with so much reference to my own personal history. I can promise him, however, that nothing of the kind will be found in the essays which here follow, and which I once more submit to the judgment of Catholics."[1]

These words were indeed the last he ever wrote of himself. They seem to be a summing-up of his work and a bequest intrusted to us. They give a clear survey of the intellectual condition and dangers of Catholics in England. If, as he says, the condition has been changed in some things by the Vatican Council, the dangers are still around us, and are ever rising again in the midst of us. But this passage is especially valuable for another reason. No truer portrait of the man can be given than in this unconscious description of himself. He was supposed to be full of self-assertion and intolerance; exaggerated and extreme

[1] "Preliminary Essay," pp. 41, 42, 43.

both in thought and language. Perhaps few men have ever been more docile to the Church, to traditionary judgments, and to the authority of theologians; few more fearful of novelties, of his own want of various learning, and of his liability to err.

It was with these dangers before him that Mr. Ward incessantly laboured in three distinct fields. First, in philosophy, without which the intellectual conception of theology can have no sound and precise foundation; secondly, in the relation between religion and politics, including the office of the Civil Power and the Civil Princedom of the Sovereign Pontiff; thirdly, on Catholic education, especially in its higher form. It would be impossible to give any adequate idea of these incessant labours without a history, which would fill volumes, and an analysis which would require a full statement of every thesis, together with the objections of opponents and the detailed answers to each. All that I can do is to give a catalogue of Mr. Ward's writings with the titles and dates. This list will be enough to show the minute and tenacious grasp of his mind. I omit the titles of works written before he submitted to the Catholic Church. They showed great power at an early age, but they belong to the history of his life. I give only those written by him in exposition or defence of the Catholic Faith; and especially his contributions to the *Dublin Review*, for it is to this I must confine what I say.

PUBLISHED WORKS BY DR. WARD.

(*Excluding all the Theological Lectures at S. Edmund's on Nature and Grace, Attrition, &c. &c.*)

Works published separately.

"Philosophical Introduction to Nature and Grace." Burns 1860.

"Authority of Doctrinal Decisions." Burns, 1866.

"Essays, Devotional and Scriptural" (from *Dublin Review*). Burns & Oates, 1879.

"Essays on the Church's Doctrinal Authority." Burns & Oates, 1880.

Pamphlets.

"Letters on the Anglican Establishment." Burns, 1852.

"Relation of Intellectual Power to Man's True Perfection" (Two Pamphlets). Burns, 1862.

"Condemnation of Pope Honorius." Burns & Oates, 1879 or 1880.

"Science, Prayer, Free Will, and Miracles." Burns, 1881. Also Pamphlets on Attrition, "The Obdurate Sinner," "The Extent of Free Will," &c. (for private circulation).

Essays in "Dublin Review."

Philosophical.

July	1869	"Philosophical Axioms."
Oct.	1869	"Explicit and Implicit Thought."
April	1871	"Certitude in Religious Assent."
Oct.	1871	"Mill's Denial of Necessary Truth."
Jan.	1872	"Mill on the Foundation of Morality."
July	1873	"Mill's Reply to *Dublin Review*."
Jan.	1874	"Mill's Philosophical Position."
April	1874	"Mill's Denial of Free Will."
July	1874	"A Reply on Necessary Truth" (to Sir James Stephen).
July	1874	"Appendix on Free Will."
July	1875	"A Reply on Necessary Truth."
July	1876	"Mill on Causation."
Oct.	1878	"The Reasonable Basis of Certitude."
April	1879	"Free Will."
Oct.	1879	"Supplementary Remarks on Free Will."
Oct.	1880	"Mr. Shadworth Hodgson on Free Will."

July 1881 "Extent of Free Will."
Jan. 1882 "Philosophy of the Theistic Controversy."

On the Relations between Religion and Politics.

July 1863 "Intrinsic End of Civil Government."
April 1867 "Catholics and Party Politics."
July 1872 "Priesthood at Irish Elections."
Oct. 1872 "The Priesthood in Irish Politics."
Jan. 1873 "Irish Priests and Landlords."
Oct. 1874 "Sovereignty in Modern States" (the Comte de Chambord).
Jan. 1875 "Mr. Gladstone's Expostulation."
April 1875 "Mr. Gladstone and his Catholic Critics."
July 1875 "A Reply on Civil Sovereignty."
Jan. 1876 "Father O'Reilly on Society and the Church."
April 1876 "Church and State."
July 1876 "Professor Mivart on Liberty of Conscience."
Jan. 1877 "Civil Intolerance of Religious Error."

Educational.

Oct. 1864 "University Education of Catholics."
July 1866 "Irish Writers on University Education."
Jan. 1869 "Principles of Catholic Higher Education."
July 1869 "Misunderstandings on Higher Education."
Oct. 1873 "Father Newman on the Idea of a University."
Oct. 1874 "Infidelity of the Day and Higher Education."
April 1878 "Catholic College Education in England."
July 1878 "Catholic College Education."
Oct. 1879 "Catholic Colleges and Protestant Schools."

The Essays on the Council, the Extent of Infallibility, Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, the Case of Galileo, the Project of Corporate Union, &c., as well as all the Devotional and Scriptural Essays, are contained in the three volumes of republished essays already mentioned and referred to, together with the circumstances under which they were written in the respective prefaces to those volumes. There are, however, a few not included in his republications; among them are the following,

which he intended to publish under a slightly altered form, divested (in some cases) of the allusions to the special circumstances under which they written:

Oct. 1863	"The Dogmatic Principle."
Jan. 1864	"Theological Errors of the Day."
Oct. 1865	"Mr. Oxenham and the *Dublin Review*."
April 1867	"Mr. Ffoulkes on Divisions of Christendom."
July 1867	"Father Ryder and Dr. Ward" (and others on the same controversy in later numbers).
Jan. 1868	"Doctrinal Apostolic Letters."
Jan. 1868	"Archbishop Manning on the Centenary."
April 1868	"St. Leo's Dogmatic Letter."
July 1868	"Mr. Renouf on Pope Honorius."
Oct. 1868	"Father Botalla on Papal Supremacy."
Oct. 1868	"The Coming Council."
April 1869	"Catholic Controversies" (also Ffoulkes' Letter to Archbishop Manning).
April 1870	"Janus and False Brethren."
Jan. 1871	"Definition of Papal Infallibility."
April 1875	"Fessler on Papal Infallibility."
April 1876	"Tradition and Papal Infallibility."
July 1876	"A Few more Words on Fessler."
April 1872	"Father Liberatore, Father Harper, and Lord R. Montagu."
Oct 1875	"Father Newman on Ecclesiastical Prudence."

Also several Philosophical Papers in the *Contemporary Review* and *Nineteenth Century* on Necessary Truth, the Reasonable Basis of Certitude, the Relation of Religious Belief to Morality, the Soul and a Future Life.

The passage quoted by Mr. Ward from the *Month* is an apt illustration of the intellectual position and the perils of Catholics in England. They are sheltered in the harbour, but the storm out at sea sends a swell within the port. It is impossible that Catholics should not be profoundly affected, and I may say infected, by the public opinion of our times. Another illustration

may be given. The emancipation of Catholics in 1829 was the opening of the gates through which the Catholics of England entered upon the rapids of what men call Modern Thought. For three hundred years the Catholic remnant of England, with a rare and heroic constancy, had preserved not only the unity of the faith, but the unity of the intellectual system on which the faith reposes. The theology of the Catholic Church has its precise intellectual system of philosophy in all the truths cognisable by the light of nature. Both unite in one intellectual system, coherent, and in perfect harmony with itself. In the three centuries of depression in England, Catholics were robbed of colleges and schools. The higher education of the laity and the education of the priesthood were obtained abroad. If the isolation of Catholics and their exile from the political and social life of the country narrowed their range of thought, it guarded with singular accuracy the unity of religious faith and the axioms and principles of Catholic life. No more beautiful Catholic homes ever existed ; no more chivalrous Catholic laymen ; no more devoted Catholic priests could be found than those who shone here and there in the gloom of our times of depression. The succession of centuries deepened and intensified the intelligent fidelity and the heroic perseverance of the men of those dark days. Not that there were wanting even then some of another spirit infected by the world and by the social atmosphere, which they breathed too gladly. Witness the Cisalpine Club, the history of the Veto, and the period described in the life of Bishop Milner. Nevertheless,

the Catholics of England were compact and firm as a phalanx in their faith, and in the principles which spring from faith and guard its integrity and its instincts.

In these same centuries how fared it with the public mind or opinion of England? For three hundred years it has been hurrying down the rapids of "modern thought." The religious compromises of the sixteenth century and the dogmatism of the seventeenth were swept over the bar by the Revolution of 1688, and have disappeared in the latitudinarianism which reigns absolute at this day. Upon this wide waste of unlimited laxity in thought and practice the Catholics of England have been launched for half a century. It would be blindness not to see the danger. It would be self-deception to believe that we can resist this strong tide without the counter-effort and the resolute attitude of our forefathers. The special dangers that are upon us are worldliness, social ambition, impatience of restraint, a seeking of secular advantages at the known risk of Catholic faith and of fidelity to Catholic instincts; a belief, or a practice which implies the belief, that we can be Catholics and yet act as non-Catholics do; and, finally, that we may breathe the atmosphere of "modern thought" in society, literature, colleges, and schools without tainting the life-blood of faith. We do not indeed now find men calling themselves, or willing to be called, Liberal Catholics. The claim to be Catholic and to give away Catholic truth and principle is hardly now to be found. Till the Italian Revolution usurped Rome, and till the Vatican Council condemned Gallicanism, men freely uttered

opinions and laid down principles of which they did not as yet see the end. They are at least silent now; and our danger is rather in the temptation to profess what is right, and to yield to what is wrong; to condemn Liberal Catholicism in words, but to be lax in practice. So long as the Catholics of England are a handful in the millions of our country there must ever be the danger of being acclimatised. The assimilating power of public opinion, of English life, and of nationalism, which is strong in our race, will long be a subtil and powerful influence dangerous to the firmness and fidelity of English Catholics. So long as this danger is around us, the writings of William George Ward will stand as a witness and a guide. We cannot hope to see raised up again in our time an intellect of such power and clearness, disciplined with such mathematical exactness, with such logical completeness, so firm in its grasp of truth, and so extensive in its range of thought and perception. But we may all strive to be like him in his childlike piety, his zeal for truth, his impatience of all paltering with principle, his docility to the Catholic Church, and his fearlessness in the declaration and the defence of all that the Supreme Pontiff, the Doctor of all Christians, has taught for our guidance.

These few and inadequate words are a poor tribute to the memory of a friend for whom I have cherished an affection of more than forty years, and of a man to whom the Church in England owes so large a debt of gratitude and of veneration for services which no one has surpassed. Nevertheless, to write them has been to me both a duty and a consolation.

X.

THE SALVATION ARMY.

(*Contemporary Review*, 1882.)

THE SALVATION ARMY.

As I have been asked to form and express a judgment on the Salvation Army, I give the following, under correction. But I need hardly say that I have been present at no services or preaching, and judge of it only from documents of its own members.

To draw a perfect circle on paper is one thing, to carry it out in stone is another. Abstract mental conceptions are always imperfectly realised in concrete human works. The Church on the eternal shore has no admixture of evil with good: the Church in this world is the field of wheat and tares. The Cathari of old and the Puritans since were impatient of this mystery of the long-suffering of God. It is well to bear this in mind when we judge of any men or works outside of the Divine organisation and unity of the faith. If good and evil be mingled in the Church divinely founded and divinely guided, what may we not look to find in any system which is of human origin, and dependent on the instability of man? Water cannot rise above its source.

1. The first observation I would make on the Salvation Army is that it could never have existed but for the spiritual desolation of England: for to our own country my remarks will be confined.

In the reign of Elizabeth the whole people, except-

ing the Catholics who remained steadfast, were nominally within the Established Church. The Brownists began the separation of what Mr. Skeats has called "the Free Churches." These Nonconformist bodies, continually multiplying, claim at this day to divide the population of England equally with the Anglican Church. In truth, if we separate those who are explicitly Anglican from the multitudes who are only passively and nominally Anglican, and those who are explicitly Nonconformists of every kind from those who are only passively and nominally Nonconformists, there will be a residuum on both sides of millions, over whom religion has no power. They live and die outside of any religious body.

When an attempt was made, some forty years ago, to ascertain the extent of church room in London, it was computed that all the existing places of worship, giving to each three services on Sunday, would provide for about 800,000 persons. The population of London was then under two millions—it is now nearly four. And great as the efforts of church-building have been, the proportion of church room is certainly not greater than it was; it is almost certainly less, for the population has increased more rapidly than the church room. What, then, is the spiritual desolation of London? Let any man stand on the high northern ridge which commands London from west to east, and ask himself: How many in this teeming, seething whirlpool of men have never been baptised? have never been taught the Christian faith? never set a foot in a church? How many are living ignorantly in sin? how many with full knowledge are breaking the laws of God? What mul-

titudes are blinded, or besotted, or maddened by drink? What sins of every kind and dye, and beyond all count, are committed day and night? It would surely be within the truth to say that half the population in London are practically without Christ and without God in the world. If this be so, then at once we can see how and why the Salvation Army exists. In a population full of faith and religious life it could have no place. There would be no need to supply, no conscious craving to satisfy, no spiritual desolation to break up. Its good tidings would be already known, and its warnings daily anticipated. A watchman's rattle is good at midnight, when men are sleeping. It is needless at noonday, when men are wide awake. We may in some degree measure the need for it by the response it has elicited. The spiritual desolation of London alone could make the Salvation Army possible.

In passing by railroad through Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool, the multitude of spires, steeples, towers, bell-turrets, gables, and roofs with crosses and other tokens of religion, must force itself upon the least observant eye. Where would the knowledge of God, and of the Name of our Redeemer, have been now but for the zeal and activity of the many irreconcilable and often conflicting bodies who have reared and sustained these places of Christian worship? Nevertheless, how great a multitude in all these cities and towns never set a foot in church or meeting-house!

So again, throughout the provinces of England and Wales, there are, it is to be feared, millions living without faith and in sin.

II. To such a population a voice crying aloud in God's Name is as a warning in the night. There is also in the most outcast a voice that answers. The conscience in man is as the worm that dieth not; and even in the worst and most depraved it bears witness against the sins of their life and state. The words death, judgment, heaven, hell, are to them not mere sounds, but strokes upon the soul. There are, indeed, men who are "past feeling," but they are like the sightless among mankind, exceptions and anomalies. The mass of men believe in right and wrong, and judgment to come. They know that they have souls, blaspheme as unbelievers may. They hope for a better life after this, and they believe that an evil life here will end in a worse hereafter. This was the strength of Wesley in the last century, and is the strength of William Booth in this. He and his, for seventeen years and more, have been calling men to repent and to turn to God. These are Divine truths which, like seeds wafted by the winds or carried by birds, strike root where they fall. Good seed will grow whoever sows it. This was the meaning of S. Paul when he said: "Some indeed, even out of envy and contention: but some also for goodwill preach Christ. Some out of charity . . . . and some out of contention. . . . . But what then? So that by all means, whether by occasion or by truth, Christ be preached: in this also I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."[1] S. Paul does not hereby sanction the preaching of those who go without being sent, much less the imperfections or faults of their preaching; but so far as it made known the

[1] Phil. i. 15-18.

Name and redemption of Christ it was to him a cause of joy. Imperfect or unauthorised preaching in the unity of the Church is disorder; but outside its unity it is at least so much of truth made known to those who will not listen to its perfect voice. Within the unity of faith, the Church has freely permitted its members to teach the truth. S. Francis of Assisi was never a priest, but he preached everywhere. B. John Colombini was not even a deacon, but a layman only, and yet from the hour of his conversion he went about preaching the Name of Jesus till he died. And after death, as his biographer tells us, when he lay upon the bier the people came and kissed his hand as if he were a priest. The Divine invitation comes, indeed, from God to the Church, but every member of it may make it known. "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come."[2] In a wilderness where there is no Shepherd, any voice crying a fragment of the truth prepares the way for Him Who is the perfect truth.

III. With these precautions we may go on, without fear of being misunderstood, to point out what things in the Salvation Army are hopeful, and what things are to be feared for it in the future.

I take the account of it from Mr. Booth's own statement.

1. The Salvation Army affects no secrecy or specialities of its own. It is open as the light in its words and acts. It offers to everybody the results of its own experience. It has no patent medicines or mysterious

[2] Apoc. xxii. 17.

spiritual prescriptions, but desires the widest diffusion of its teaching and mode of acting.

2. It has no compromises in its teaching. It holds to the "old-fashioned Gospel" of salvation from "real guilt, and real danger of a real hell," through Him Who gives "real pardon to the really penitent," and "to all who really give up to Him a whole heart, and trust Him with a perfect trust." And this doctrine it holds as "embodied in the three creeds of the Church."

3. It teaches that "sin is sin no matter who commits it, and that there cannot be sin without Divine displeasure; and that all men are responsible for accepting or rejecting the perfect deliverance from sin provided by our Lord." It deals largely with "the terrors of the Lord," believing that soft and soothing doctrines may easily be, and are at this day, too prominent, and even exclusive of the eternal truths.

4. It holds that we ought to lay down our lives for the salvation of others, in the full sense of the second precept of charity.

5. Its organisation is military. Having tried government by committees and by democracy, and finding that those who work do not care to talk, and that those who talk do not much care to work, its government was reduced to two simple principles—namely, to authority and obedience.

6. Its officers and preachers are continually, and often suddenly, changed from place to place, to prevent local and personal attachments.

7. The General has never received a penny out of the funds of the Army; and the Army depends abso-

lutely on the providence of God. But it seems to possess property in trust.

8. It believes itself to be guarded against the admission of self-seeking and interested people by the great sacrifices they must make to become members: and against "drones" by the heavy obligation of holding from nineteen to twenty-five meetings a week, extending over thirty to thirty-five hours; and of spending eighteen hours in visiting the poor.

9. Finally, Mr. Booth declares his firm resolve that the Salvation Army shall never become a sect. He cites the failure of John Wesley in his attempt to maintain an unsectarian position. The meaning of this would seem to be that the aim of the Salvation Army is to promote general and personal religion apart from all bodies, and, above all, apart from all controversies.

This summary is almost in the words of its chief; and if the work answered to the conception, it would rank high among the movements external to the Catholic unity in prudence, zeal, and devotion. It exacts a life of labour, in poverty, in sacrifice of self, and in obedience.

It is a less pleasing task to turn to the other aspect of the Salvation Army, and to point to the fears which it suggests.

1. If it were certain that the conflicts and assaults of which we have heard arose as inevitably as the afflictions of S. Paul at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, we might feel no check to our sympathy. But S. Paul did not go in array, nor with the pomp and circumstance of war. If, on the one hand, this bold bearing be a sign of apostolic courage, it is hardly a sign of apostolic

prudence. It is hardly the advent of "the Son of Peace;" and its sounds are rather of the whirlwind than of the still small voice. It is hardly like the conduct of our Divine Master, Who, when the Pharisees were offended, "withdrew Himself," lest they should add sin to sin. It is one thing to rebuke sinners as S. Peter and S. Stephen did, and another to challenge opposition by military titles and movements with drums and fifes. These things seem not only unwise for the Salvation Army, but dangerous to souls. The "offence of the Cross" is inevitable if we preach "Christ and Him crucified;" and both wisdom and charity lay on us an obligation not to add to it by any needless provocation.

2. We also need a clearer explanation of its teaching. It says that salvation and sanctification are the work "of a moment." There is no doubt that the forgiveness of sin is bestowed in a moment, as when the father fell on the neck of the prodigal on his return; and when our Divine Lord said to the man sick of the palsy, "Thy sins be forgiven thee;" and when in His Name at this hour absolution is given to the contrite. All this is an act of grace on God's part—full and complete when He bestows it. They who are forgiven are in a state of salvation, in which, if they persevere, they will be saved. But the work is not yet finished; and sanctification is only begun. God might, indeed, complete it, like our regeneration, in a moment. But He does not do so. That is not the Divine method. The cleansing of the soul and the infusion of perfect sanctification are progressive works. This was said in an

article in the *War Cry*, in substance correctly enough, though in words and phrases not sufficiently guarded.

3. A still graver objection is to be found in the practice of what is called "the training of converts." "The moment any man, woman, or child professes to have received remission of sins, we require them to stand up and tell the audience." In this we must believe spiritual dangers of the most perilous kind to be inevitable. First, each one is to be the judge of his own state; next, he is to make instant and public profession of it. Against those who resolve the certainty of their adoption as sons of God into their own inward consciousness even Luther said, "I rest my adoption, not on my own assurance, but upon the act of God in my baptism." This is building on the rock, the other is building on the sand. If the Salvation Army builds its work on such foundations, how can it stand? There is no form of deception or self-deception which this does not invite. They who know least of themselves, of the sinfulness of sin, and of the sanctity of God, would be among the first to believe in their own salvation. If there be any warning in God's Word more constant and more urgent than another, it is humility and self-mistrust. The instant public profession, that is, the calling of all eyes and ears and attention upon themselves, is the last thing that the Spirit of God in any record of Holy Scripture counsels or warrants. The rising up of any one in the midst of a congregation with such a profession seems like: "God, I thank Thee that now I am not as other men are; not even as those around me." This surely is not

the voice of humility, nor could any humility long endure such a training. If it be said that such public profession is an act of thanksgiving, we must answer that the best thanksgiving is the humblest. If it be said that it is a humiliation, we must answer again that self-imposed humiliations are the most subtil of all snares. It may be that a person of mature experience in the spiritual life may, without self-consciousness, lay open his life and state in public. But that men, women, and children, kneeling in the front row of a public meeting, should at the outset of their conversion tell the audience the work of God in their souls without danger to humility, sincerity, or reality, is contrary to the spiritual experience of the world.

This observation extends to the usage of making the "Saved" put an "S," or some such sign, upon their collar. Believing the last danger of the spiritual life to be what is called "the Storm in the Harbour" —that is, spiritual complacency springing from self-consciousness and self-contemplation, which wrecks even those who have escaped from the perils of the deep into the port of safety—we must look with great fear upon a system which systematically calls out into activity the self-complacency latent in all men, and trains it by an elaborate external discipline. Such was not the training of the first disciples, or of the early Christians, or of the confessors and martyrs of any age, whether in persecution or in peace. Humility, sorrow for sin, conversion to God, like the frost and the dew and the light, work silently, and with a Divine power. An old writer says: "Ira est, non gratia, cum quis

ponitur super ventum nullos habens radices in soliditate virtutum." The history of the Church is full of examples of conversion which have no roots, or such only as are in flesh and blood. They have been the most public and self-proclaimed, but the least fruitful and the least abiding. If this be true within the unity of the Catholic Church, and under the strong guidance of its discipline, what may we look for among those who are outside of its shelter, and choose their own guides and their own way?

4. And this leads on to another fear. There is a distinction to be ever maintained between essential devotion and sensible devotion; between the rational sorrow for sin and the emotional sorrow for sin. Essential devotion is a constant and fervent exercise of the will in obedience to God. Rational sorrow for sin is the judgment of the reason and the conscience condemning ourselves. And these things are calm and inward; often they have no outward sign except a change of life. Many of the most devout have little emotion, and many of the most penitent never shed a tear; but their piety and their repentance are deep, still, and changeless. They begin in the spirit, and they end in the spirit. Not so those who begin in emotion, or excitement, or self-consciousness. There is great danger lest they should end in the flesh. All who have had experience in these things will know the meaning of these few words.

5. One more objection is as follows: The head of the Salvation Army is resolved that it shall never become a sect. In this he is wise. A sect is soon

stereotyped. He seems to wish that it may not be a sect, but a spirit, which, like the four winds, may blow upon all the valley of dry bones—men, women, children, sects, communions, and, as he perhaps would say, Churches, quickening and raising them all to a higher life. So long as the Salvation Army teaches the three creeds in their true sense, and does not assail the Catholic faith or Church, it is so far doing a constructive, if it be only a fragmentary, work. God "would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth."[3] So far, then, as it brings men to any truth, even though it be only one truth, such as a belief in God, in this evil and unbelieving generation, it is doing a work beyond its own foresight. Looking, as we must, over the spiritual desolations of England, every voice that speaks for God is on our side. In the measure in which its teaching is more perfect, our hopes and our sympathy grow greater. When the Apostle said, "Master, we saw a certain man casting out devils in Thy Name, and we forbad him, because he followeth not with us," the answer was, "Forbid him not, for he that is not against you is for you."[4] If it be said that the Salvation Army does not cast out devils, S. Augustine would answer that the conversion of a soul from sin to God is a greater miracle. And no man can doubt that God makes use of His own means to bring souls to Himself. At times He uses some whom He has not sent to rebuke those in whose hands the Apostolic commission slumbers. Nevertheless, we have a conviction that the Salvation Army

[3] I. Tim. xi. 4. [4] Luke ix. 49, 56.

will either become a sect, or it will melt away. This world is not the abode of disembodied spirits. The history of Christianity abundantly proves that neither the human intellect nor the human will can alone perpetuate any teaching without change. Nor can human authority or human obedience perpetuate itself without an organisation which compacts and sustains both. But what is such an organisation but a sect? One more of the separate bodies which have either departed from some parent sect, or have aggregated themselves together out of the dispersed and scattered units in our wilderness of souls. The Divine Wisdom has provided for the perpetuity of truth in a visible and world-wide organisation, in which the faith is guarded and sustained "yesterday, to-day, and the same for ever." Our fidelity to this Divine and immutable organisation, which "is terrible as an army with banners," gives to us a measuring rod whereby we can measure the deviations of those who are outside of its unity, and the dangers to which those deviations lead.

There remains still one more, and that a yet graver fear, as to the future of the Salvation Army. Its material dissolution would be a small evil compared with the demoralisation resulting from the reckless language in which the most sacred subjects are often treated. In the last number of the *Contemporary Review*, in two articles, examples were given which are too displeasing to be repeated here. They were well called "rowdyism." No mistake is greater than to think that to speak of God and of Divine things in low language brings truth nearer to the minds of the poor

or of the uneducated. No words are more elevated, and none more intelligible to the multitude, than the language of the four Gospels. Low words generate low thoughts; words without reverence destroy the veneration of the human mind. When man ceases to venerate he ceases to worship. Extravagance, exaggeration, and coarseness are dangers incident to all popular preachers; and these things easily pass into a strain which shocks the moral sense, and deadens the instincts of piety. Familiarity with God in men of chastened mind produces a more profound veneration; in unchastened minds it easily runs into an irreverence which borders upon impiety. Even the Seraphim cover their faces in the Divine presence. When levity or coarseness is permitted in preaching, or prayer, or hymns, we fear that it will deaden the reverence of some and provoke the blasphemy of others. The *War Cry* and the *Little Soldier* are both disfigured by such language, and the latter by still graver faults. Ceaseless watchfulness would be needed to keep its preachers and teachers within the limits of pure and sober speech. But who shall control the utterances of men, women, and children in the front row in the moment of their supposed conversion? And, above all, when such unbecoming language is used, and even enjoined, as a means of rousing attention. They who do so must have forgotten S. Paul's rejection of human arts, and his simple trust in the Word of God, and in the power of His Spirit.

In all this the action of the Salvation Army is

deplorably below the mental conception of it given in its own professions, at the outset of this paper.

Such are some of our fears for this zealous but defiant movement. Our fears greatly overbalance our hopes. Nevertheless, our heart's desire and prayer is that they who labour so fervently with the truths they know may be led into the fulness of faith; and that they who are ready to give their lives for the salvation of souls may be rewarded with life eternal.

XI.

WHY ARE OUR PEOPLE UNWILLING TO EMIGRATE?

(*Murray's Magazine*, 1887.)

WHY ARE OUR PEOPLE UNWILLING TO EMIGRATE?

Is it true that the people of the United Kingdom, or of England chiefly, are unwilling to venture abroad? This is a question to which our whole history for centuries has seemed to give a peremptory no. The settlement of the American plantations; the creation of the New England States; the peopling of the West India Islands; the occupation of Canada, Australia, South Aftica, to say nothing of the half-million who govern the Indian Empire: all these unequalled enterprises of the British and Celtic races place the United Kingdom at the head of all the colonising peoples of the world. Nevertheless, there is at this day a reluctance in our people to rise up and to fare forth into lands beyond the sea. This *vis inertiæ* has no doubt always existed, even when our great historical adventurers and colonisers were leading out the first fathers of our Colonial population. There was then a majority who looked on in wonder at the daring and hardihood of those who left them behind. This will also be true now, but this is not the question we have to meet. Is there, as it is affirmed, a special reluctance at this moment, more than at other times, in our people to leave their mother country? There are reasons to believe this to be true;

and these reasons are partly inherent in all people, and partly resulting from causes which need not and ought not to exist. We will try to weigh both, but our chief care is to examine these latter causes which ought to be removed: for we are responsible for their removal.

Though there is no people in the world more maritime and adventurous than the people on the seaboard of England, Ireland, and Scotland, there is no people more rooted in their homes than the midland population of these islands, especially of England. The Teutonic love of home prevails over the Scandinavian love of the sea. Our Saxon forefathers were not seafaring. Three sea-voyages were a qualification for an earldom. There is no doubt that the love of home is deep-rooted in the English people. Nothing more beautiful and peaceful can be found than a homestead of the midland and southern counties: a thatched cottage, with creepers on the wall; a garden with roses and lilies, apple-trees and a cherry-tree, a bed of potatoes and lettuce, and often a corner sown with wheat. Such homes as these, half a century ago, were the freehold and the heirloom of a ploughman or a shepherd, who could remember his father and mother by the bright peat fire, and has seen his own children playing on the threshold. It is no wonder that men and women should shrink from going out from all that holds their hearts so fast. These homes are, indeed, passing away, but they still exist. There is, however, a reverse of this picture. For long years one-third of the people have congregated in our cities and towns, many of them in hovels not fit for

human habitation; families overcrowding single rooms with all the human miseries of such inhuman state. We should have thought that they would have readily risen up in the hope of a better shelter; but, strange to say, the *vis inertiæ* is still strong; and they cling even to the sufferings which have become a second nature. Add to this, the love of their mother country, which is a part of natural piety, with the love of kindred and friends. These are bonds fast enough to bind strong men or to hinder their spirit of venture. In the Irish race the love of the very land on which they were born, and in which they would fain be buried, is so tender, that when they leave it they will carry with them some handfuls of its earth to be laid with them in their graves.

Another restraining cause is a fear of the unknown: the perils by land and sea, with all the toil and privations of journeys and voyages. They have been so long patient under their lot, that they shrink from the chances of any change. And to this is to be added the uncertainty of success in an unknown land, and in an untried lot. They have already a hard task to deal with and to master in the difficulties of their daily struggle for bread, and what will they be able to do in a new state, which they do not know, and for which they have never been trained? They have had full experience of the uncertainties of their past life which they can measure and meet; but the future in an untried lot they can neither measure nor forecast. They will have to begin life over again, leaving behind them all the investments that they have laid up in the goodwill and confidence of

those among whom they have grown up to manhood. It may be also that they have entered into middle life: and to make a new launch is a great venture in which many have sunk. All these uncertainties would weigh with a man who is alone in the world, and has no one to care for but himself. How much weightier they become when he has wife and children, and perhaps a father or mother, depending upon him!

There remains one other reason, very powerful in its effects. If the people have cause to think that there exists in any quarter a desire to clear them off the face of their mother country, every instinct of manhood and of natural independence rises up to rivet them to the soil, in which they have an inalienable right to so much as will give them burial. We need not dwell on this point. It must be stated lest it should be forgotten, and when stated, it will not be forgotten as a law of natural justice before which human laws must hold their peace.

So much, then, for the reasons and causes which make our people unwilling to venture abroad.

We will now turn to see how far this unwillingness has prevailed. Notwithstanding all the restraining motives hitherto enumerated, there has been a steady and strong yearly stream of emigration from England, Ireland, and Scotland. In the last thirty years 3,000,000 have left our shores. From the last Return of the Board of Trade, published by Mr. Giffen, it appears that the number of British-born subjects who left our shores in the first three months of 1886 was 30,700; in 1887, 44,446, that is, 14,000 more than in

RETURN of the NUMBERS, NATIONALITIES, and DESTINATIONS of the PASSENGERS that left the UNITED KINGDOM for places out of EUROPE during the MONTH ended MARCH 31, 1887, and the THREE MONTHS ended MARCH 31, 1887, compared with the corresponding periods of the previous YEAR.

MONTH ENDED MARCH 31.

NATIONALITIES.	United States.		British North America.		Australasia.		All other Place .		Total.	
	1887.	1886.	1887.	1886.	1887.	1886.	1887.	1886.	1887.	1886.
English	8,438	4,951	2,302	1,011	1,710	2,131	983	695	13,433	8,788
Scotch	2,361	1,107	307	70	256	432	113	102	3,037	1,711
Irish	6,298	2,821	208	69	294	424	41	18	6,841	3,332
Total of British origin	17,097	8,879	2,817	1,150	2,260	2,987	1,137	815	23,311	13,831
Foreigners	11,180	5,844	464	33	60	30	130	101	11,834	6,008
Nationality not distinguished	...	...	...	...	...	...	254	184	254	184
Total	28,277	14,723	3,281	1,183	2,320	3,017	1,521	1,100	35,399	20,023

THREE MONTHS ENDED MARCH 31.

English	16,658	11,191	3,127	1,513	5,929	6,402	2,477	2,119	28,191	21,225
Scotch	4,094	2,079	406	124	846	917	369	290	5,715	3,410
Irish	9,159	4,767	363	164	907	1,057	113	77	10,542	6,065
Total of British origin	29,911	18,037	3,896	1,801	7,682	8,376	2,959	2,486	44,448*	30,700*
Foreigners	14,881	10,059	512	94	224	140	317	531	15,934	10,824
Nationality not distinguished	...	...	...	...	6	...	905	514	911	514
Total	44,792	28,096	4,408	1,895	7,912	8,516	4,181	3,531	61,293	42,038

Commercial Department, Board of Trade, April 5. R. GIFFEN.

the previous year. Again, 44,000 in all left this country, and of these 30,000 went to the United States. We must be glad that our people should find a home in the United States, and the growing number of English-born who mingle with the population of the States will be, we may trust, a growing security for the amity and unity of the two countries. Nevertheless, it must obviously be our desire that our people should find their home within the bounds of our own lands. One of the aims of the movement in behalf of State-directed colonisation is to guide the stream of emigration into our own channel, and to retain our brethren still as subjects with us of the British Empire.

In his Report to the Board of Trade, Mr. Giffen pointed out that the emigrants who succeed in the Colonies powerfully attract those whom they have left at home; emigrants follow emigrants, they attract each other. Each new settler draws to him others from the "mother country." Mr. Maguire, in his work on the Irish in America, has given large evidence on this point. The multitudes who went to the United States during the famine fever of 1847 drew after them an immense following; and vast sums of money were transmitted to Ireland to bring parents or kinsmen over the Atlantic. The reasons in this case were no doubt exceptional, and specially constraining; but the same attraction has been found to exist not in Ireland only, but in England and in Scotland. A foreign land loses its strangeness and distance when parents or children have already made it their home. The more this attraction is strengthened by larger emigration, the less

powerful will become the restraints which keep men at home. It is certain that the spirit of adventure and of courage which animated our forefathers when the New World was first opened has become dormant among us. And yet England of that day was large enough for its population of five or six millions. There was then room enough for all and to spare. We are now crowded to excess. Our population grows by nearly 400,000 every year: our four seas are inexorable in their blockade. It is, therefore, a dictate of natural prudence to encourage this attractive power of our Colonies, and to enlarge the range of its influence. And, further, so to direct it that the manhood and energy, the intelligence and the skill, of our race shall not wander beyond our bounds; but shall expand the mother country and build up our commerce and empire. In the year 1886, 232,900 persons of British origin left our shores; but the annual growth of the population, as shown by the census, in Great Britain is nearly double that number. Every year, therefore, the pressure of population on our narrow surface is becoming more serious. It is affirmed that in the agricultural counties of England 75,000 are born every year, or three-quarters of a million in ten years. For these there is no employment, and it is computed that of them 600,000 go into the manufacturing and mining counties, or into London and its suburbs. So that not more than 150,000 go beyond sea.

No doubt want of will to leave the country is a powerful obstacle, but it is certain that want of means keeps at home many that would be willing to go. And

this also explains why so many go to the United States. The voyage is shorter and cheaper. Excepting only Canada, our Colonies are distant and the sea-passage is dear.

Evidence has been given from all parts of the United Kingdom during the last five or six years showing beyond doubt that very large numbers of our working population have been from time to time only occasionally employed, or altogether and for long periods of time out of employ. This is disputed every year as to London; but though loose statements may exaggerate the case, it is undeniable that large numbers suffer from want of work for weeks and for months. But it must be borne in mind that want of work for a day is loss of wages, and loss of wages is loss of food for many mouths. It is easy to be stoical when suffering does not touch us. The life of those who live by toil is more than from hand to mouth, for when the hand is idle for a day, the mouth is empty. Mr. Alfred Simmonds, President of the Kent and Sussex Labourers' Union, in a pamphlet three years ago, has shown how fallacious are statistics on the alleged decrease of pauperism. He says: "Attention has been directed to the Poor Law Returns. Lord Derby has publicly exhibited the figures, and has claimed that, there being a considerable decrease in the number of persons receiving parish relief, the inference must be drawn that the poor are better off than heretofore. Under ordinary circumstances this would be so. As a matter of fact, the direct contrary is the case at the present moment. The decrease of pauperism, *as shown by the*

figures, means a terrible increase of poverty and starvation. Let us see. Let us take the Returns of Pauperism *for the decade* 1872 *to* 1882. In 1871-2 the old Poor Law Board issued repeated orders to the Boards of Guardians to be more stringent in granting outdoor relief. When the Local Government Board superseded the Poor Law Board, the new authority continued the crusade against outdoor relief, and still do so. In lieu of outdoor relief the 'order for the house' is given—the 'house test' applied. Large numbers of poverty-stricken families prefer their rags, their own overcrowded room, with its killing atmosphere, their misery, their independence, rather than enter the workhouse. I sympathise with them. I would do the same myself. It is not to be assumed that I am advocating indiscriminate outdoor relief, but observe the operation of the 'house test.' In 1872 there were in England and Wales 977,400 paupers, namely, 154,000 indoor and 823,000 outdoor. The figures have changed. In 1882 there were in England and Wales 797,000 paupers, namely, 188,000 indoor and 609,000 outdoor. Showing a decrease of 214,000 outdoor; but *an increase of no less than* 34,000 *indoor paupers*. Regard these figures in the light of the 'house test' policy, make full allowance for attempted imposition, and who would voluntarily imagine the mass of concealed heart-breaking, the hopeless misery represented by the decrease of outdoor paupers?"

The number of indoor paupers has steadily increased since 1882. The Poor Law Returns for 1885 show that the number of *indoor* poor had increased up to that

time to an excess of 40,000 beyond the number of *indoor* poor in 1872.

But it must not be thought that the Poor Law Returns give any adequate measure of the poverty of our population. They exhibit only the helpless and hopeless state of nearly a million of our people who are ready to perish. But these are not the kind of whom emigrants or colonists are made. No colony could redeem them: no colony would receive them: nor would the mother country be guilty of deporting them to die abroad. There are, however, other classes among whom the severest poverty is found. And it may be without fear asserted that there is a larger number throughout the country who periodically suffer the extremes of poverty. A rational and commendable pride, which is self-respect and a sense of honest independence, forbid their applying to a relieving officer. The Royal Commision on Education in 1860 divided the poor into the dependent poor, and the independent poor. The dependent were in workhouses, prisons, and other public institutions. The independent poor comprised all others who live by "work and wages." But of these, excepting only a few who can lay by, such as the unmarried or the childless, it is strictly true to say that they live always, even in full work, upon the brink of poverty. A sickness, an accident, the bankruptcy of a master, a bad harvest, a cotton famine, illness in the family, vicissitudes in trade, and changes without end, may at any moment throw them out of work, and even if by thrift they have laid by a little, a few weeks will exhaust it. This will include three whole classes.

1. Artisans with all their skill. 2. Small tradesmen ruined by co-operative competition, or by the failure of their customers—that is, of workmen out of work. 3. And both of these classes when they have sunk to the state of precarious and transient or casual employment.

These three classes are steadily sinking into extreme poverty, and many even into pauperism. Between poverty and pauperism there is a broad difference. The best of men and the best of families may sink into extreme poverty, but they can only become paupers through their own vice, or through the house test, which relieves a family only on the condition of breaking up its home, and, with it, all hope of recovery. Men driven by their own misery and the misery of those dear to them are the prey of demagogues. The three classes before described are not paupers, and ought never to sink into pauperism; nor, with exceptions, would they ever become paupers if a wise and adequate help were promptly given to them. They might become efficient and thriving colonists, if there were at home and abroad a public spirit which is watchful over the people and cares for the prosperity of the Commonwealth. But public spirit is rare and low in these days of self-indulgence.

One of the most distinguished of the Colonial representatives reproached us the other day by the following contrasts. He said: "We in Australia know everything that happens in England." Such was the substance of his words. "We sedulously read your many newspapers, and we know the details of every thing that passes. You never see our newspapers, and

you know nothing of us. In this there ought to be a reciprocity of knowledge and of sympathy. We feel ourselves to be unknown and out of mind."

If the upper classes, who have all the means of knowledge, know so little of the Colonies, is it a wonder that the people know less? How, then, should they dream of what they do not know? They seek work till they are weary, and ask help till it is exhausted: they turn their hands to everything that they can find till they can find no more. But the thought of a new land, a new home, a new beginning, with a new future of work and hope, is beyond the horizon of their daily wants and cares. It is not their fault. How should they think of that of which they have never heard, of which even those above them so little know?

The Colonial Governments have done something to diffuse knowledge among the people at home. But still, how few have knowledge certain and detailed enough to move them to any serious thought of such a venture? The Imperial Exhibition of last year; the presence of so many of the chief men of our Colonies, the statesmen, governors, prime ministers, judges, and merchants; and the Colonial Conference of this year, have done much to rouse attention and inquiry.

It must, however, be said to the honour of some of our self-governing Colonies that they have done much in the last ten years. Canada, New Zealand, Queensland, New South Wales have voted, and advanced in loans, large sums of money to enable people to migrate from England to their soil. Between 1873 and 1883 many thousands accepted this aid. But now, Canada alone

continues this assistance. The others have practically ceased. New Zealand and the principal Australian Colonies used to grant free or assisted ocean-passages. Multitudes availed themselves of this help. And even since this help has been withdrawn, the offices of the Colonial Agents in this country have been beset by working people anxious to go to the Colonies. Queensland still grants free passages to farm-labourers, and to women domestic servants under stringent regulations as to age and fitness. The office of the Agent-General is so pressed by applications that for some months to come no more can be admitted.

Mr. Simmonds, already quoted, is now Secretary of the State-directed Colonisation Society, and from him the statistics here given are derived. He has been long engaged in the work of emigration. As secretary of the State-directed Colonisation movement, he has been enabled to send out 11,000 of our working people in the ten years between 1873 and 1882. And since the Colonial Governments discontinued the granting of free ocean-passages, though he has been compelled to give public notice that they were no longer granted, nevertheless he computed the number of persons wishing to leave England for our Colonies at nearly 10,000. He believes also that if the Government at home and the Governments of the Colonies would join hands in a system of State-directed Colonisation, 50,000 applications would at once come in.

The causes, then, which make people unwilling to go over the sea will never be overcome except by a fuller knowledge of the state of the Colonies, and of

those who settle in them; nor, again, until, by wise co-operation between the mother country and the Colonies, the means of transit and of settlement shall have been secured to those who are willing to go.

It will be seen that by State-directed colonisation is not meant the transporting of individuals singly as adventurers without mutual relations, and without provision made for them in the land whither they are going; nor, again, is it proposed that this shall be done by grants of public money, but by loans and by commercial enterprise. Societies some time ago were willing to convey families to Canada, to build a dwelling on land granted by the Canadian Government, and even to cultivate a portion of the land for the first year's subsistence at a rate so moderate that the loan could be easily paid off. What Juvenal says of honesty may be said of State-directed colonisation, "Probitas laudatur et alget." Everybody praises honesty, but leaves it out in the cold. Everybody commends colonisation, but declares it to be financially impossible. And so it will be until Government at home and over sea shall take it resolutely in hand.

That what has been said may not end in vagueness, it will be well to set down precisely the scheme of State-directed colonisation which was submitted to Lord Granville, then Colonial Secretary, and by him referred to the Local Government Board.

1. The Imperial Government to create a permanent Colonisation Board; the representatives in London of co-operating Colonies to sit *ex*

officio on the Board. The Colonisation Board to be responsible to H.M.'s Secretary for the Colonies.

2. The Imperial Government to provide the necessary funds by way of loan.
3 The Co-operating Colonies to place in the hands of the Colonisation Board tracts of Government lands for colonisation purposes.
4. The people proceeding to the Colonies to be classed as (1) emigrants or (2) emigrant colonists. The former class to be sent only where labour is known to be in demand; the latter class to be planted on the lands in the hands of the Colonisation Board.
5. Pioneer parties of single-men emigrants to be sent under contract to clear and prepare lands, build dwellings, &c., for the emigrant colonists to follow after.
6. The emigrant colonists to undertake to repay by annual instalments the cost of their settlement, with interest.
8. The Colonial Governments to nominate experienced Colonists to act, for a time, as resident superintendents of settlements, and to establish in each settlement a post-office and money-receiving house for the reception of repayments, with power to enforce payments due if necessary.
8. Food stores to be provided during the early stages of the settlement under the superintendent; advances to be made to settlers until the arrival and sale of first crops.

9. The Colonial Governments to reserve sites in each settlement for public buildings and trades.
10. No person to be sent without the approval of the representative of the Colony concerned.
11. The Colonisation Board and its operations to be kept distinct from Boards of Guardians, and from all contact with pauperism.
12. Colonies desiring labour only, to make special contract with the Colonisation Board.
13. Each Colony to be invited by the Home Government to work with the Colonisation Board, especially in respect to shipping and other like interests.

This scheme is now under careful examination. On the 11th of February last a meeting was held, which resulted in the formation of two Committees, one of members of the House of Lords, the other of members of the House of Commons. All political or party character was carefully excluded from the treatment of this question by the selection of secretaries from each side of the two Houses, namely, Lord Longford and Lord Monkswell for the Lords, and Mr. Lawson and Mr. Seton-Karr for the Commons. These Committees have been working both apart and in confidence.

We have no need to prove the benefit that would result to the country, both at home and abroad; to the development of the Colonies and of the Imperial commerce; to the consolidation of the Empire by bonds and sympathies stronger than all federations. All this is admitted even by the objectors who dwell on the

financial impossibilities. A hundred years ago, who would have believed the creation of the British Empire to be possible? When once some such Colonisation Board shall have formed its relations with the Colonial Government, the unwillingness of our people to go abroad by reason of want of knowledge, want of means, want of advice, want of help, want of the plain, practical, and direct facilities of such a venture, will be overcome. For the existence of these obstructions we are all responsible, and shall be so long as we go on coldly objecting to every plan, and magnifying the financial difficulties. When once these causes are removed, the people will be found prompt and glad to venture, as were our forefathers, into lands which are no longer strange and wild to them, but their mother country still, and a home beyond the sea.

XII.

OUR NATIONAL VICE.

(*Fortnightly Review*, 1886.)

OUR NATIONAL VICE.

Our nation has a multitude of vices. Is there any vice that cannot be charged against us? But is there one vice that is head and shoulders above all others? Is there one that, by its stature and its sway, dominates over all around it? We have lately had comparative statistics from Italy, showing the proportion of murders, assaults with intent to kill, immoralities, commercial frauds, and the like. Under the first three heads England is comparatively innocent. But commercial frauds would thus seem to dominate. Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his *Essay on Commercial Morals*, seems to confirm this charge. We are, however, plunging into the democratic period, and have become of late profusely and shamefully factious. But as yet faction does not dominate over our other vices, or over our patriotism. We are told that under the crust of our national Christianity there lie unimaginable depths of immorality and unbelief; nevertheless it cannot be said that this, or any of these, or all of them together, constitute our national vice. Let us, therefore, test this matter by a series of questions.

I. Is there, then, any one dominant vice of our nation? To answer this let us ask:

1. Is there any vice in the United Kingdom that

slays at least 60,000, or, as others believe and affirm, 120,000, every year?

2. Or that lays the seed of a whole harvest of diseases of the most fatal kind, and renders all other lighter diseases more acute, and perhaps even fatal in the end?

3. Or that causes at the least one-third of all the madness confined in our asylums?

4. Or that prompts, directly or indirectly, seventy-five per cent of all crime?

5. Or that produces an unseen and secret world of all kinds of moral evil, and of personal degradation which no police-court ever knows and no human eye can ever reach?

6. Or that, in the midst of our immense and multiplying wealth, produces not poverty, which is honourable, but pauperism, which is a degradation to a civilised people?

7. Or that ruins men of every class and condition of life, from the highest to the lowest, men of every degree of culture and of education, of every honourable profession, public officials, military and naval officers and men, railway and household servants; and, what is worse than all, that ruins women of every class, from the most rude to the most refined?

8. Or that, above all other evils, is the most potent cause of destruction to the domestic life of all classes?

9. Or that has already wrecked, and is continually wrecking, the homes of our agricultural and factory workmen?

10. Or that has already been found to paralyse the

productiveness of our industries in comparison with other countries, especially the United States?

11. Or, as we are officially informed, renders our commercial seamen less trustworthy on board ship?

12. Or that spreads these accumulating evils throughout the British Empire, and is blighting our fairest colonies?

13. Or that has destroyed, and is destroying, the indigenous races wheresoever the British Empire is in contact with them, so that from the hem of its garment there goes out not the virtue of civilisation and of Christianity, but of degradation and of death?

There is not one point in the above questions which cannot be shown by manifold evidence to meet in one, and one only, of our many vices. Of what one vice, then, by which we are afflicted can all this be truly said? Is it not the language of soberness to say that if such a vice there be, it is not one vice only, but the root of all vices? Mr. Gladstone has said, in words which have become a proverb, that the intemperance of the United Kingdom is the source of more evils than war, pestilence, and famine; and to this it must be added that the intemperance that reigns in our nation does not visit us periodically like war, but is year by year in permanent activity; that its havoc is not sporadic but universal; that it is not intermittent but continuous and incessant in its action. It is no rhetoric, therefore, nor exaggeration, nor fanaticism, to affirm that intemperance in intoxicating drink is a vice that stands head and shoulders above all the vices by which we are afflicted; and that, comparing the United King-

dom, not only with the wine-growing countries of the south, which are traditionally sober, but with the nations of the north, such as Germany and Scandinavia, which are historically hard drinkers, we are pre-eminent in this scandal and shame; and that intemperance in intoxicating drink may, in sad and sober truth, be called our national vice.

II. Let us pursue our search a little farther. If all these manifold evils spring from intemperance in intoxicating drink, from what does this pre-eminence of intemperance in intoxicating drink itself arise? Is it an epidemic, or an endemic? or a property of our British blood, or a national inheritance which has become inseparable from our race. No; its prevalence at this moment, and its extension year by year, is traceable to two causes.

As a nation, we were always mighty drinkers of ale, and the Statutes at large have endless ineffectual enactments to repress the evil. We then began to be strong drinkers of wine, and both ale and wine flowed on in a deepening flood; but the mightiest evil which is now upon us had not as yet arisen. For the last three hundred years alcohol, which till then had been almost confined to scientific experiments and to certain trades, became not only a common drink, but an agent with which both ale and wine were medicated, giving to them new and intenser qualities of intoxication. The wines of Spain and Portugal are not only medicated for their transit, but for the English taste. It is true, indeed, that our national tradition of intemperance is an inheritance of more than a thousand years; and the

history of our national shame may be seen summed up in a book called *The Discipline of Drink*. Evidence is there given how Kings and Parliaments strove to restrain the evil by legislation, and how Bishops and Councils both made and enforced severe penitential canons against the intemperate. For the last three hundred years these canons have had no application, and the legislative enactments have resulted in a system of licensing laws of which it will not be too severe a sentence to say that all their barriers have been overwhelmed and swept away in the swelling flood of intoxicating drink.

It is not to be denied that the vice of intemperance is an heirloom which cleaves to us like the shirt of Nessus.

But these evils might perhaps have been brought by legislative and moral authority within some control were it not for two causes which have lifted it to its fatal pre-eminence. The first cause is the enormous capital of one hundred and thirty or one hundred and forty millions which is annually employed in the supply and sale and distribution of intoxicating drink; and the other, the complicity of Government in raising more than thirty millions of revenue from the same trade.

For the sake of brevity, the capital employed in the Drink trade may be called a monopoly, held in the hands of some hundreds of distillers and wine merchants, some thousands of brewers and publicans, and all these, with their servants, covering the whole country, and numbering altogether nearly half a million of persons.

It is obviously the interest of these capitalists to drive onward their trade with all possible activity and expansion. The greater the demand the better for them; the greater the supply the greater the multiplication of the places and facilities of sale. They do not intend to make the population of the United Kingdom drunk, but in the prosperity of their trade the facilities of drunkenness are necessarily multiplied, and the increase of drunkenness is inevitable. The statistics of the police in cities and boroughs, and throughout the country, are often quoted to show that intemperance is not upon the increase; but such statistics really prove nothing. They exhibit only what may be called criminal intemperance, that is, drunkenness coupled with contravention of the law. The police are instructed not to interfere with man or woman, however drunk, if they are quiet, and their feet can carry them home. They are charged only to arrest those that are "dangerously drunk" or "helplessly drunk." Such statistics are absolutely valueless in the inquiry we have before us, namely, as to the extent of the moral, personal, domestic, private, and public vice of intemperance. It is enough to call attention to the fact of the steady increase, far exceeding the ratio of the increase in the population, both in the places where intoxicating drink is sold and in the capital which is employed in the trade. In the year 1829 the places of sale were about fifty thousand; they are now nearly two hundred thousand, that is fourfold, but the population has hardly doubled. Eighteen years ago, that is about the year 1868, the capital employed was estimated at eighty-two

millions. In 1880 it was estimated at a hundred and thirty-eight millions. Some years ago, in the time of commercial prosperity and of high wages, the amount was estimated at between a hundred and forty and a hundred and fifty millions. Among all the trades in this country there is only one that always prospers. Every trade at this moment is depressed, but the Drink trade is always increasing; fresh capital is always ready, and the commercial interests of the great capitalists in this monopoly must always prompt them, by all efforts, to take advantage of every opening to increase their profits. On one side are ranged the interests of this monopoly, the capital of which exceeds the capital employed in our great staples of iron, or cotton, or cloth; on the other are ranged the welfare of the people of the United Kingdom, the sobriety of our race, the order and well-being of homes, without which no commonwealth can long endure, for the political order rests upon the social, and the social order rests upon the domestic, life of men. This is a great controversy and a vital issue. It is on its trial before the supreme tribunal of the public opinion and of the popular will of the nation; and for the last thirty years the public opinion and the popular will has been rising and spreading, resolved to try this issue against the powerful and growing Drink trade in behalf of the life and homes of the people.

Much more ought to be said on this first cause of the evils under which we suffer; but it is necessary to pass to the second cause—namely, the complicity of our Government in raising one-third of its revenue from the

trade in intoxicating drinks. It is the most prosperous trade, and therefore the most readily taxable. The rich do not complain of it, and the intemperate pay no heed to price. It has also a virtuous aspect, which is, nevertheless, illusory—namely, that by raising the price of drink the facilities of intemperance are diminished. It is certain that the most ascetic Chancellor of the Exchequer will go on resting in confidence on the tax on intoxicating drink. His interest in its prosperity is only second to the interest of the great monopoly. It has been found in India that the taxes on drink and the taxes on opium are the readiest means of relieving the revenue; and the natives have in vain petitioned the Government to withdraw from this complicity, pleading that so long as it is the interest of the Government to raise the revenue by such taxes, the consumption and the sale of intoxicating drink and drugs will always increase. The same, and more profoundly, must be the belief of her Majesty's lieges in the United Kingdom.

III. Unless what has hitherto been said can be refuted, our intemperance is not only the national vice but a national danger. It is precisely in our great industrial cities and centres that the vice of drunkenness is most rife; and it needs little reflection to foresee what would be the condition of those centres if, as some years ago, our great industries were to fail. When men and homes are suffering there is little reasoning. Hunger has no logic, but it has a burning thirst. The safety of the commercial world is being sacrificed to swell the profits of the Drink trade. But

the safety of the Commonwealth is above both, and ought to interpose its mandate.

Hitherto the capitalists of the Drink trade and their friends, both political and interested, have swayed the elections, the House of Commons, and the Government. But in proportion as the suffrage has been extended to the people, men who know the needs and desires of the people have been sent to Parliament. The people have long lost confidence in licensing authorities. They wish to protect themselves. The friends and advocates of the Drink trade have posed as the friends of the people. They have assumed to speak in the name of the people, and to plead their cause. We have been told that the people need and wish for public-houses. It is strange, then, that the most popular House of Commons should contain nearly three hundred members pledged to Local Option; and about half of them in favour of a direct local veto. It is surely intolerable that public-houses should be put down in the midst of the homes of our working men without their consent. It is they who suffer. It is they who pay for the evils of drink. It is their homes that are wrecked, their families and children that are ruined. Every motive of justice prescribes that they should be locally and personally consulted, and that they should be able by a free vote to speak for themselves, and to protect their own homes.

Our national vice will never be corrected from above.

Governments, magistrates, and police have laboured, or seemed to labour, for these three hundred years to

diminish or to control the spread of intemperance. They are too remote to influence the millions of the people. The coercive power of the police defeats itself. What is wanted is not a mechanical repression, but a dynamical power which can only be found elsewhere. It has never been found in the upper classes of society. They are too far removed from the life of the people to be conscious of the immensity of the evils which exist below their own level in life; or they are directly interested as capitalists, or as possessors of house property; or they are prejudiced by the imprudence and exaggeration of certain persons, and will neither see nor listen; or they are too delicate to touch so vulgar a subject; or they are refined free livers themselves; or they are thoughtless of the wreck of souls; or though never intoxicated they are sometimes not sober; or they belong to the *pessimum genus otiosiorum* of idlers, triflers, and jokers, who, if they are ever serious, lament the evils of intemperance, and then mischievously obstruct the labours of more earnest men who are striving to save men, women, and children from the havoc of drink. It is a sad truth that, though in our upper classes there is an ardent and faithful minority labouring against our national vice, there is a vast majority, either too deeply interested or too little in earnest, to help those whom, consciously or unconsciously, they are persistently hindering. It is such as these who were forward some years ago in opposing Sir Wilfrid Lawson, because his Bill, as they said, was only a permissive Bill, and not an Imperial and universally coercive Bill. They well knew that before such an universal coercive Bill could

be carried the end of the world would come. And if it had been carried it would have been a dead letter, for nothing could have enforced it short of martial law. Nevertheless, men of this kind were wont to declaim eloquently on the impossibility of making a nation sober by Acts of Parliament, and arguing that sobriety can only be attained by moral means.

We heartily accept this half-truth; and it is precisely because we believe that our national vice can only be cured by a spontaneous, national, and moral movement, that we affirm that the only adequate power for its correction must come not from above, but from below. It is in the people themselves alone, who have been so long beset by the multiplying facilities for intemperance, by the ubiquitous activity of the Drink trade, by the almost irresistible attractions of gin-palaces; it is only in the spontaneous action of the people, rising with their high moral sense in reaction against the system which has so long made their homes desolate and their lives intolerable, that an adequate remedy can be found. We have already seen that in the measure in which the electoral suffrage has been extended, the people have returned to Parliament men pledged for Local Option. A still more luminous proof of this fact may be found in our Colonies, in which popular self-government exists in its fullest and healthiest form. Already in the Dominion of Canada, in Australia, in New Zealand, the young and popular Legislatures have closed the public-houses on Sunday, and are giving powers of Local Option to the people. It is impossible not to foresee that the example of the Colonies will react upon the mother

country. Already Scotland and Ireland have Sunday Closing Acts. In spite of every form of evasion and opposition, the Sunday Closing Act in Wales holds its ground. Yorkshire, Durham, and Cornwall, with a singular unanimity, have forced upon Parliament the Sunday closing movement. For the last six or seven years their Bills have been blocked, talked out, and contemptuously rejected. But this will not be for ever. There is an onward movement in the public opinion and in the moral sense of this country which renders it inevitable that before long the people will obtain from Parliament a local vote in the matter of public-houses, as they already possess it in the matter of education.

Some years ago the *Pall Mall Gazette*, in treating of the suffrage of women, avowed its belief that, if women could vote, the Permissive Bill would be carried at once. Nothing can be more certain; for as our national vice wrecks the domestic life of the people, it is upon the women of the United Kingdom that the full and fierce misery springing from intemperance falls in its dire intensity.

XIII.

HISTORY OF THE PAPACY DURING THE REFORMATION.

(*Dublin Review*, 1887.)

HISTORY OF THE PAPACY DURING THE REFORMATION.

PROFESSOR CREIGHTON'S work is the fairest and most solid history of the Mediæval Church that we have yet seen from any hand that is not Catholic. We make this reserve, because, in the commendation that we may give, it is always necessary to bear in mind that a Catholic hand would not have written many things that are contained in it. Nevertheless, it fulfils in a remarkable degree the profession which the author makes in the preface to his third volume, where he writes as follows: "If the writers of the Middle Ages are to be reduced to the scientific view of historical progress which we now adopt, the same treatment ought in all fairness to be applied to the literary men of the Renaissance. The credulity displayed in the gossip of the one has to be appraised as carefully as the credulity of the miraculous records of the others. I have attempted to found a sober view of the time on a sober criticism of its authorities." The author has been faithful to this engagement; and the book is marked by research of original documents, by accuracy in dealing with ecclesiastical matters, and by a calm, judicial discernment.

The title given to the book is narrower than its

contents; for it begins as early as the great Western Schism, before as yet the Reformation, as commonly understood, had arisen. Nevertheless, it is true that long before that period a clamour for reformation in "head and members" had long been heard. The title may, therefore, be justified in this sense. It is certain that the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle were the forerunners of the Council of Trent, down to which Professor Creighton intends to continue his work; and also that the Renaissance, and all the flood of intellectual and moral evil which deluged Italy and infected Rome, was the prelude of the Lutheran Reformation. In this sense, therefore, the title may be justified, for it contains the twofold Reformation, legitimate and illegitimate, Catholic and anti-Catholic, Constructive and Destructive, the one which was wrought by the Church, reforming itself from within, the other, which, in attempting to reform the Church from without, has ended in confusion. No doubt the learned author when he treats of the Council of Trent will not fail to observe that of almost every session of the Council, twenty-five in number, a large part is headed "De Reformatione;" nor will he fail to appreciate the profound and world-wide reformation which the Council of Trent has wrought in the last three centuries. In the preface to the first volume, the author says: "I have taken the history of the Papacy as the central point for my investigation, because it gives the largest opportunity for a survey of European affairs as a whole." This mode of procedure shows a true discernment; for, as Donoso Cortes affirmed:

"The history of civilisation is the history of Christianity, and the history of Christianity is the history of the Catholic Church, and the history of the Catholic Church is the history of the Pontiffs, the greatest lawgivers and rulers of the Christian world." In the introduction to the first volume, the author treats of the rise of the Papal power, and in his mode of treatment follows the same line as Mr. Bryce in his book on the Holy Roman Empire. Both these learned authors occupy themselves with tracing out the external, secondary, and human events which led to the formation of the Papal power and the Holy Roman Empire. But in neither is there a recognition of the primary and vital force from which these two creations sprang. The Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire, apart from the Divine institution of the Catholic Church, would be merely external and human organisations. No human intelligence or power can adequately account for them. They were both living systems: the Church having life in itself, and the Empire having life from and of the Church, and enduring so long as it was faithful to the principle from which it sprang. *Omne vivum a vivo*, and nothing is sustained but by the principle from which it springs. Professor Creighton seems at least to recognise these primary laws. He says: "The theory of the Papal monarchy over the Church was not the result merely of grasping ambition and intrigue on the part of individual Popes; it corresponded rather to the deep-seated belief of Western Christendom" (vol. i. page 12). It is not without surprise, therefore, that we read that the Forged

Decretals "form the legal basis of the Papal monarchy;" and "the importance of the forgery lay in the fact that it represented the ideal of the future as a fact of the past, and displayed the Papal Primacy as an original institution of the Church of Christ." Nevertheless, he adds: "The Papacy did not originate this forgery; but it made haste to use it." But how should the forgery have deceived anybody, if it had not in the main closely corresponded with the facts before the eyes of men? A bank-note may be forged, but it proves the existing currency of bank-notes, and could deceive nobody if it did not minutely correspond with the genuine bank-note. The truth is, that the Forged Decretals, except in subordinate details of ecclesiastical procedure, truly reflect the Divine primacy which was the deep-seated belief of Western Christendom—that is, of the Catholic world. After Tertullian had become Montanist, he assailed the Bishop of Rome as "*Pontifex Maximus*, issuing peremptory decrees;" but these words would have had neither point nor meaning if the visible primacy of the Bishop of Rome had not corresponded with them.

The divisions of the whole work, as far as it has yet advanced, would appear to be as follows: First, the Great Schism; from the year 1378 to 1414. Before this period the unity of the Empire of Charlemagne had been broken up into separate States, and the spirit of nationalism had profoundly divided the Cardinals and the local Churches. Nothing can more clearly demonstrate the Divine unity of the Church than its survival and its restoration of itself out of the conflict

of national schisms. The impotence of individuals to break up the unity of the Church had been long ago demonstrated, and now the impotence even of nations was conspicuously demonstrated in this period of the Great Schism. The unity of the Church reasserted itself in the Council of Constance; and nearly five centuries have passed in which the union of the Church with its head have been more than ever luminously manifested. The second period reaches from the Council of Constance in the year 1444 to 1464, which the author calls the Papal Restoration. During this period Constantinople fell under the power of the Turks. From that date the influx of Greeks and of Greek literature into Italy gave rise to the literary movement of the Renaissance. In treating of this subject the judicial fairness of the author is conspicuous, and affords a contrast with the learned but prejudiced volumes of Mr. Symonds. It must, however, in justice to Mr. Symonds, be said that he has faithfully and fully exhibited the inflated vainglory, the morbid self-love, the childish petulance, the boundless licentiousness, and the virulent foulness of tongue of the Humanists. Professor Creighton gives a calm and tame description of the literary quarrel between Poggio and Valla. He says: "Not content with repelling Poggio's attacks, or attacking his literary character, he cast aspersions on his private life. Poggio retorted by opening the floodgates of abuse on Valla. Every scandalous story was raked up. Every possible villainy was laid to his charge; nay, even a picture was drawn of the final judgment of the great day, and Valla was

remorselessly condemned to perdition. . . . . The contest was carried on by clothing the lowest scurrility with classical language." Poggio and Valla are fair samples of these literary duellists. Mr. Symonds' book is still more abundant in these literary quarrels; and his whole narrative shows that the effect, if not the aim, of the Humanists was to restore classical tastes, classical standards of thought and action, classical morality—in a word, pure paganism, to the derision and extinction of Christianity.

Mr. Symonds gives examples of their language as follows: God was *Jupiter Optimus Maximus;* Providence, *Fatum;* the Saints, *Divi;* their statues, *Simulacra Dei Sanctorum;* Our Lady of Loreto, *Dea Lauretana;* SS. Peter and Paul, *Dii tutelares Romæi;* the souls of the just, *Manes pii;* the Pope's excommunication, *dirae;* his tiara, *Infula Romulea;* the Seven Churches, *Septem Sacrasancta Divum pulvinaria.* Bembo advised Sadoleto to avoid the Epistles of S. Paul lest the barbarous Latinity should spoil his style.

Although Mr. Symonds describes so profusely the profound immorality of the Humanists, and affirms that the genius of the Renaissance followed the first Medicean Pope from Florence into Rome, nevertheless he fastens upon Rome and the Papacy the profuse immoralities which he describes, as if they were the up-growth of the Holy See, instead of the leprosy of the Renaissance itself. And yet he says that "the intrusion of the Humanists into the Papal Curia was a victory of the purely secular spirit." Professor Creighton is discern-

ing enough to perceive that the infidelity and the immorality of the Humanists invaded Rome from without, and involved the Papacy from Sixtus IV. to Leo X. in every kind of accusation and dishonour. Mr. Symonds says that "bullying and fawning tainted the sources of history," and that "licentiousness became a special branch of Humanistic literature. Under the thin mask of humane refinement leered the untamed savage." The profound corruption of manners springing from this restored paganism pervaded the whole mind of Italy with the foulest imaginations and darkest suspicions of all public personages, both men and women. There is no kind of domestic or private crime, from incest to poisonings, which was not imputed to them. The whole literary atmosphere was black with malevolent accusations. We can almost believe that we are reading the description of Rome in the sixth satire of Juvenal. One single example may be given—namely, Lucrezia Borgia. Mr. Symonds, with the full swing of Lord Macaulay's style, describes her as if she were Messalina. Professor Creighton, with the cautious judgment of an historian, shows his mistrust at such alleged enormities. Mr. Roscoe long ago pointed out that the first traces of these accusations appeared in the writings of certain Neapolitan poets, who were exasperated by the policy of Alexander VI. He says that they would scarcely have deserved a serious reply if Guicciardini had not reproduced them as "rumours." From that time Catholic writers have repeated them, and Protestant controversialists have revelled in them. But, as Mr. Roscoe has pointed out, they are not only incredible from their

enormity, but Lucrezia Borgia was received by marriage into the illustrious family of Este as Duchess of Ferrara, an event morally impossible if her life had been so deeply stained and so publicly infamous. Contemporaneous writers such as Giraldi, Libanori, Caviceo, and many others, describe her as of uncommon excellence, virtuous, and modest. And the unanimous testimony of history is that for twenty years her life as Duchess of Ferrara was conspicuous in blameless dignity. It may be well here to remember two examples in our own history. Protestant writers have described Anne Boleyn as a paragon of virtue and religion; Catholic writers have laid to her charge crimes too black to repeat. Her latest biographer, Paul Friedmann, with all these contradictions before him, and with the advantage of later and more authentic documents, does not, indeed, clear her fame, but rejects the darkest imputations under which she died. Again, if we are to believe Scottish historians, Mary Queen of Scots was guilty of profligacy and complicity in the murder of her husband. Every successive historian of later date, with the continual accession of new documents and of fuller evidence, has cleared her name, not, perhaps, of all early levity, but of these foulest charges. We have reason, therefore, to believe that when the history of the Papacy before the Lutheran revolt shall be rewritten, in the growing light of additional documents and fuller evidence, much that even Professor Creighton has allowed to stand in his pages will be cleared away. Certain it is that the succession of Pontiffs described by Ranke stands in such abrupt and singular contrast with those

that went immediately before them as to render much that we read of the Popes in the fifteenth century improbable, if not incredible. It was the fashion of Protestant controversialists to hold up a list of more than thirty Popes whom they would have the world believe to be heretics or of unsound doctrine. As time went on one after another disappeared from this list, until it was reduced to two only, Liberius and Honorius. Against Liberius no heterodoxy can be alleged. Against Honorius no allegation was made until forty years after his death, in the beginnings of the Greek Schism. We have reason, therefore, to believe that the course of history in the future will cleanse many a great name. Nevertheless, in the meantime, it is enough for us to remember that Caiphas was high priest and that Judas was an apostle.

A third period, according to Professor Creighton, dates from the pontificate of Sixtus IV., at which time the Papacy engaged itself, by diplomacy and by war, in the politics of Italy. In his judgment Sixtus IV. began the secularisation of the Papacy. "From that time onward," he says, "the Pontiffs became Italian princes, and by the enrichment of their kinsmen became the founders of the Papal families which exist to this day." The fourth volume closes with the pontificate of Leo X. and the Lateran Council of 1520.

Professor Creighton laid down for himself the duty of founding a sober view of the credulity and gossip of those ages on a sober criticism of authorities, a duty of absolute obligation for any historian who desires to

ascertain the truth rather than to indulge his prejudices. There has been no great personality in any age of the Church of whom two characters have not been recorded by contemporary writers. The Divine Head of the Church prepared all His Vicars upon earth to expect such treatment, when He said, "The disciple is not above his Master." He was denounced as a deceiver, a pretender, and a demoniac. His Vicars have been baptised with His baptism.

If we are to believe the narrative of Ferretus, we should believe Boniface VIII. to be what Dante was deceived into believing, but Muratori has proved its mendacity; nevertheless, Sismondi reproduces it. In the tenth century Luitprand so blackens his adversaries, including the Pontiffs, that his calumnies would have passed undetected if Flodoard had not written at the same time. We may take as illustration two modern examples: the character of S. Thomas of Canterbury as defaced by Mr. Froude and as drawn by Mr. Freeman; and, again, the character of Henry VIII. in Mr. Froude's *History of England*, and the Henry VIII. presented by Paul Friedmann in his *History of Anne Boleyn*. These examples are enough to put us on our guard against the studied accusations of partisans, and the credulous gossip of the world. Professor Creighton has weighed in the balance the conflicting evidence of such pontificates as those of Innocent VIII., Alexander VI., and Leo X., observing carefully the rule he prescribed for himself, "a rumour gains nothing in credibility by repetition; the question must

always be, what is the evidence of it?" The following passage is a sample of his candour:

"Spain was aggrieved at the reception into the Papal States of the refugee Jews or Moors, who were driven from Spain by the stringency of the Inquisition. Spaniards, in the assertion of their nationality, were desirous to rid themselves of all foreign elements, and employed the Inquisition for that purpose. The crowds of luckless *Marrani*, as they were called, awakened the compassion of the Italians, who saw them arrive on their coasts, and many of them came to Rome, where they were subjected to no persecution. A crowd encamped outside the Appian Gate, and were the means of bringing an outbreak of plague into the city. The Papal tolerance was displeasing to the Spanish rulers, and the ambassador expressed his wonder that the Pope, who was the head of the Christian faith, should receive into his city those who had been driven from Spain as the enemies of the Christian faith. We do not find that Alexander VI. paid much heed to these remonstrances; the Papacy in its spirit of tolerance was far in advance of public opinion."

To this passage is added the following note:

"Writers who themselves regard toleration as a virtue sneer at the Papal treatment of Prince Djem and the Marrani as proofs of Papal indifference to religion, following in this Infessura. I do not consider this fair, as the Papacy in the Middle Ages always showed a tolerant spirit in matters of opinion."

The following words describe the death of S. Catharine of Siena:

"The legend goes on to say that some of those who called on Catharine of Siena were miraculously released. It was the last miracle wrought by Catharine in the flesh, as she died on April 29, 1380. In the dismal history of these gloomy times she presents a picture of purity, devotion, and self-sacrifice to which we turn with feelings of relief. In her intense and passionate desire for personal communion with Jesus, Catharine resembles the fervent nature of S. Francis of Assisi; but her lot was cast in times when zeal had grown cold in high places, and she spent her energy in agonised attempts to heal the breaches of the Papal system. A simple maiden of Siena, she ventured

in her Master's name to try and redress the evils which were so open and avowed. She saw Italy widowed of its Pope; she saw the Church venal and corrupt; and, though she was inspired by mystic enthusiasm, she worked with practical force and courage to restore the Papacy to Italy, and inaugurate an era of reform. In urgent tones she summoned the Popes from Avignon, and Urban V. answered to her call. She went from city to city pleading for peace, and in the discharge of her mission shrank neither from the fierce brawls of civic passion, nor the coarse brutality of the condottiere camp. Before her eyes floated the vision of a purified and reformed Church, of which the restoration of the Papacy to its original seat was to be at once the symbol and the beginning. Blinded by her enthusiasm, she hailed with delight the accession of Urban VI.; and by the side of the violent and vindictive Pope her pure and gentle spirit seems to stand as an angel of light. She did not long survive the disappointment of the Schism, and though she remained constant in her allegiance to Urban VI., his character and actions must have been a perpetual trial to her faith. She died at the age of thirty-three, and the removal of her influence for mercy is seen in the increased vindictiveness of Urban's measures. Canonised by Pius II., Catharine of Siena has a claim upon our reverence higher than that of a saint of the Mediæval Church. A low-born maiden, without education or culture, she gave the only possible expression in her age and generation to the aspiration for national unity and for the restoration of ecclesiastical purity (vol. i. pp. 70, 71)."

Every Catholic in reading this beautiful passage will desire that Professor Creighton may some day correct it with a Catholic hand.

The history traced in these four volumes shows with what relentless storm the gates of hell have ever beat against the rock of Peter. The prophecy is twofold: first, that they shall never prevail; but secondly, they shall never cease to storm against it. In the long history of the Church, from the day when Peter descended from the guest-chamber to preach his Master's name, a continuous and ever-changing warfare of every

kind of human perversity and preternatural deceit has striven against the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Centuries of martyrdom, heresy, schism, barbarian hordes, Imperial tyranny, and, more dangerous, Imperial favour, the revolt of nations, the rising again of paganism, the flood of all refined and gross immorality, the pride and perversity of intellect, the gnosticism of private judgment, the revival of persecution unto blood, wars, captivities, revolutions, and the usurpation of Rome itself, have never prevailed against the imperishable See of Peter. It is more majestic at this day in its world-wide authority and its infallible voice, in the unity of the Episcopate in itself and with its Head, and in the loving obedience of the universal flock, than at any time since the Prince of the Apostles was crucified in the gardens of Nero.

XIV.

A PLEADING FOR THE WORTHLESS.

(*Fortnightly Review*, 1888.)

A PLEADING FOR THE WORTHLESS.

THE workless and thriftless have had their sentence. Let me plead now for the worthless. There was once a commonwealth in which every wrong against a neighbour was judged and punished, not only as a wrong against man, but also against a higher law. The lord of the harvest did not glean his fields, nor did the master of the vineyard and of the olive-yard go twice over the vines and the olive-trees. The gleaning and the after-gathering were for the poor, the widow, and the orphan. Usury was unlawful. The lender might take a pledge for repayment of a loan, but he might not take the stone by which the borrower ground his corn, nor the cloak in which he slept at night. If taken in pledge by day, it was to be restored by nightfall. Every fifty years all prison-doors were opened, all debts absolved, all lands returned to the rightful heir. Even the lower animals shared in the generous equity of the common law. The ox was not muzzled when he trod out the corn, and he rested on the seventh day.

And yet this commonwealth was not Christian, nor the unconscious inheritor of Christian civilisation.

Does history tell us that such words as follow could, without aberration of mind, have been addressed to such a commonwealth?

"It seems almost incredible that in wealthy England, at the close of the nineteenth century, so much destitution should exist; and, still more, that vagrancy and mendicity should so prevail. It may be well asked, Is this the grand total result of the wisdom of our legislators, the efforts of our philanthropists, the Christianity of our Churches: that our streets are infested with miserable creatures, from whose faces almost everything purely human has been erased, whose very presence would put us to shame but for familiarity with the sight—poor wretches, filthy in body, foul in speech, and vile in spirit—human vermin? Yes, but of our own manufacture; for every individual of this mass was once an innocent child. Society has made them what they are, not only by a selfish indulgence in indiscriminate almsgiving, but by permitting bad laws to exist, and good laws to be so administered as to crush the weak, and wreck the lives of the unfortunate.[1]"

But these words have been publicly written as an impeachment of Christian and civilised London. The justice of the impeachment cannot be denied.

I. My purpose is to trace out the causes of this monstrous wreck of humanity, and to see how far we are responsible for the creation of these dangerous and pitiable outcasts from our Christianity and our civilisation.

1. The first cause of this social wreckage is the destruction of domestic life. A large proportion of

[1] *Workless, Thriftless, Worthless.* By Francis Peck. *Contemporary Review*, January 1888.

the people in London are herded in places not fit for human habitation. While the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Poor was sitting, efforts were made again and again to set on foot an inquiry as to the number of the people who were thus inhumanly housed. Such an inquiry was held to be impossible. The reason of this reply I have never been able to ascertain. But Governments seem to shrink from the trouble or the expense of inquiry. If there be any impiety in numbering the people, as some good men said at the time of the first census, there can be no impiety in numbering the miserable. The number of families living in one only room is less indeed now than a few years ago; but the number of families of from five to ten persons living in two rooms—fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters, of all ages, and sometimes with lodgers—is still very great. I will not enter into details. Any one who heard, or has even read, the evidence taken before the Housing Commission will never forget it. That which creates a people is domestic life. The loss of it degrades a people to a horde. The authority and the obedience, the duties and the affections, the charities and the chastities of home, are the mightiest and purest influences in the formation of human life. A good home is the highest and best school; it forms and perpetuates the character of a nation. What moral influence or formation of the life and character of children is possible in overcrowded dens where all is misery and confusion? I refer to the report of the Commission, and to the evidence of Lord

Shaftesbury and Mr. Horsley, and gladly refrain from explicit details.

2. The next cause of utter wreck is, I will not say intoxicating drink, but the drink trade. This is a public, permanent, and ubiquitous agency of degradation to the people of these realms. That foul and fœtid housing drives men and women to drink, and that drink renders their dens sevenfold more foul and fœtid, is certain. The degradation of men, women, and children follows by an inevitable law; but only those who are striving to save them have any adequate knowledge of the inhuman and hopeless state of those who have fallen into drunkenness. I am not going to moralise upon drunkenness. I will only say that the whole land is suffering from the direct or indirect power of the drink trade. In times of depression only one interest still prospers—its profits may be slightly lessened, but its gains are always large and safe; that is, the great trade in drink, which enriches half a million of brewers, distillers, and publicans, with the trades depending on them, and wrecks millions of men, women, and children. This one traffic, more than any other cause, destroys the domestic life of the people. The evidence taken by the Housing Commission expressly shows that in the overcrowded rooms in Dublin the moral wreck wrought in London is not equally found. A counteraction or preservative is there present and powerful. This I can affirm also of a large number of homes in London. The same is affirmed on evidence of Glasgow. Nevertheless, these exceptions only prove the rule. The drink trade of this country has a sleeping

partner who gives it effectual protection. Every successive Government raises at least a third of its Budget by the trade in drink. Of this no more need be said. It changes man and woman into idiocy and brutality. It is our shame, scandal, and sin; and unless brought under by the will of the people—and no other power can—it will be our downfall.

3. A third cause of this human wreck is the absence of a moral law. It is materially impossible for one half of the population of London to set foot on a Sunday in any place of moral teaching or of Divine worship. If all the churches and places of worship were filled three times on Sunday, they would not, I believe, hold more than 2,000,000. But the population of London properly so called is 4,000,000. Of the remaining 2,000,000 of men, how many have received Christian education, or even Christian baptism, or moral teaching? How far is God in all their thoughts? This may be an argument without weight to some of our social philosophers; but to those who still hold fast, not only to faith, but to the intellectual system of the world, it is a fact of evil augury, as self-evident as light. They who think themselves able to live and die well without God will treat this assertion lightly; but they who believe, with S. Jerome, "Homo sine cognitione Dei pecus," will be unable to understand how the moral life of men can be sustained without the knowledge of God. Where there is no legislator there is no law, and where there is no law each man becomes a law to himself; that is, the perversion and passions of his own will are his only rule of life. What ruin to

himself and all depending on him comes from this needs no words. Look at our calendars of crime and our revelations of social vice. And yet every one of these human wrecks was once an innocent child.

From these three chief causes comes all personal demoralisation by immorality, intemperance, and ignorance, and, therefore, by poverty in its worst form. From these also come the greater enormities, as some appear to think—namely, imposture and idleness. Such are the social outcasts that form our criminal or dangerous class. And so long as they are born in dens, and live in drunkenness, and die without the light of God's law, they will multiply and perpetuate their own kind. Multitudes are at this day in London in the abject poverty of moral degradation, and of reckless despair of rising from their fallen state. But these three causes are the direct results of the apathy or the selfishness of what is called Society, or, more truly, of our legislation, or neglect to legislate, or of good laws inefficiently administered.

II. Some are of opinion that a great part of the crime in London springs from poverty. Others say that in times of distress the gaols are comparatively empty. This would seem to imply that want does not lead to crime. Both of these assertions are true. No one will say that poverty always leads to crime, much less that poverty never leads to crime. Therefore, both sides admit that poverty sometimes leads to crime. This reduces the question to one of degree: how far is poverty a cause or motive to crime?

There is, indeed, no necessary connection between

poverty and crime; for poverty is a state which may generate the highest human perfections of humility, self-denial, charity, and contentment in a hard lot and life. Such a lot may be the inevitable lot of some. It may be also voluntarily and gladly chosen by others, who for many motives not of this world, choose poverty rather than wealth.

But this is not our question. The poverty of which we speak is that into which the majority of poor men are born; in which they hardly earn bread for themselves and for their homes; a poverty always on the brink of want, to which they may be reduced in a day by no fault of their own, that is, by the ruin of their employer,the vicissitudes of trade, the suspension of work by natural causes, such as winter, or the failure of the raw material of their labour. When once reduced to this state of want, there is nothing before them but the legal relief of the Poor Law, coupled with conditions which their highest and best instincts make them refuse, or doled out to them inadequately, so as to give no real and lasting relief. This forms a pauper habit of mind; helplessness, hopelessness, and the loss of self-respect. Will any thoughtful man say that in such a state a father, seeing a wife sinking by want and toil, and his children famishing for lack of bread, is free from the strong temptation to find unlawfully the food which society refuses, except on odious conditions, to give him lawfully? Add to this the sense of injustice when, without fault of his own, he is brought down to want. And, as men are human, there comes in a sting of resentment when he sees on every side an

abundance of food and clothing in those who never labour and never lack.

The ostentation of luxury is a sharp temptation to men in despair. It is not only the hunger that pulls down a man's own strength, but the cry of those who look to him for bread that sounds daily in his ears, and haunts him wherever he goes. This is true of the most upright and honest man; but all men are not honest and upright. Surely it is Pharisaism to preach to such men, "Go in peace; be you warmed and filled; yet give them not those things that are necessary" for the body. It is both injustice and hardness of heart to denounce almsgiving, to defeat the giving of work, and to offer nothing but the break-up of home as the condition of food necessary for life. If such a man begs, he may be taken up. If he can bear his miseries no longer, and steals, his moral rectitude is broken down; and once destroyed, all boundaries are gone.

They must know little of life who do not know what ruin of men and of women comes from the straits of poverty. Forgery, embezzlement, prostitution, are brought on gradually, and after long resistance to temptation, even in the educated, by the desperation of want. Will any one say: Yes, but they imply vice as the motive. I answer: And are the poor free from vice? But again, vice is in such cases the consequence as well as the companion of crime. The moral nature has given way. The misery of want destroyed it before vice or crime was perpetrated. There was a time when forgers and prostitutes were as far from their fall as those who moralise about them when fallen.

And if this be true of all men, how much more true of the worthless for whom I am pleading?

A student of crime the other day thought that he had disproved the proposition that poverty leads to crime by showing that in times of distress the prisons have fewer inmates; and that the statistics of crime show a diminution of prisoners in the ten years from 1877 to 1886, which was a period of depression.

A little more thought would show that this is no disproof.

For, first of all, Sir Lyon Playfair some years ago exhibited in a tabular form, resulting from official inquiry, conclusive evidence to show that when wages are low drunkenness decreases, when wages are high drunkenness increases. Shall we, then, say that prosperity leads to crime? If so, blessed indeed are the poor! Surely no man will maintain that prosperity is to be checked and deprecated, and that the duty of legislators and political economists is to reduce the prosperity of the country in order to check the crime.

Moreover, the proposition that poverty leads to crime does not mean that poverty on Monday leads to crime on Tuesday, but that poverty leads to all manner of temptations. Sometimes the misery of innocent children will drive a man to do what his conscience condemns. Sometimes a daughter, to support an aged mother, will do what her whole soul abhors. They who live among statistics, and have seldom, if ever, lived among the poor, little know how poverty brings temptation, and temptation both vice and crime.

But as we have statistics, let us go to them, though

they are like the quadrants and compasses by which the tailors in Laputa measured their customers. The moral life of men cannot be measured by mere numbers. Nevertheless, they are pointers.

And, first, it is beyond contention that the majority of our prisoners are of the poor. This fact alone proves at least the close relation of poverty and crime. It would be an affectation of scepticism to say that this close relation is not by way of cause and effect.

Secondly, the official statistics show this both directly and indirectly.

At page xxxix. of the Judicial Statistics for England and Wales in 1886-87, it is stated that of the people committed for crime, 27·5 per cent could neither read nor write, 70·0 could only read or write imperfectly, only 2·8 could read and write well, and only 0·1, or one in a thousand, had superior instruction.

If it be said that this proves ignorance to be the cause of crime, I answer that poverty was the main cause of this ignorance.

Thirdly, the occupation of prisoners gives the same indication. Of no occupation there were 10·5 per cent; labourers, charwomen, and needlewomen, 52·0; factory workers, 6·0; skilled mechanics, 14·1; professional employment, 0·2, $\frac{2}{100}$; prostitutes, 3·3; domestic servants, 2·5.

These statistics prove beyond doubt that, in proportion as the criminals are further from poverty, the smaller the number; in proportion as they are nearer, the greater the number; and that the vast majority are those who are absolutely poor, and live in all the

vicissitudes of poverty. It is an old-world saw that half our virtues are from the absence of temptation.

But, lastly, the statistics of increase in indoor paupers and decrease in prisoners in the years between 1877 and 1886 prove nothing. There are many explanations of this fact. I have it on high authority that thousands of adults who used to be imprisoned are now fined under the amended Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1879; and thousands of children who used to be sent to prison are now sent to reformatory or industrial schools, or let off with a reprimand. The Report of 1887 shows for Great Britain the number of children in industrial schools as follows:[2]

In 1877	12,555
„ 1880	15,136
„ 1886	20,688

These two facts fall precisely into the ten years from 1877 to 1886, and prove that a change both in the treatment of persons charged and in the tables of statistics had been made, which accounts for the decrease of prisoners.

III. From the change in the administration of the Poor Law two consequences have followed. First, a profuse almsgiving.

We have been told with great confidence that five millions of money were spent in a year in alms in London alone. Without doubt much was imprudently spent; and this imprudence caused many accidental evils of mendicity: mendacity, indolent dependence upon help, neglect of duty, wastefulness, and refusal

[2] Report for 1886, p. 9.

to work for bread. But to affirm that this is the inevitable result of almsgiving is to condemn what the Author of Christianity enjoins. And there have not been wanting men of note and name who have censured His teaching as erroneous. The effect of these excesses is to provoke a reaction which is somewhat strong and vivid in certain minds. Again, to tell us that almsgiving springs from selfish indulgence of emotion, or of self-contemplation, is as shallow as the Hutchinsonian philosophy, which tells us that men do right only because it makes them happy; or the Benthamite, that they do so because it is expedient. Compassion has suffering for its proper object, as hunger has bread. These philosophies of the second syllogism are credible to those who know of no Divine commandments; but to those who know a higher law and a nobler lore they would be simply ridiculous, if they were not mischievous. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the charity and generosity of individuals and of societies were profusely abused; and that the accidental evils of good things when abused were many. But it is to be borne in mind that this large almsgiving of five millions of money arose, not only from the promptings of charity, but from the constant sight of suffering unrelieved by the Poor Law. If it had been more compassionately administered, these five millions would in all likelihood have never been given. They rose to this vast sum by the daily sight of unrelieved want. It was so far a spontaneous return to the profusion of old days.

And here it may be well to call to mind the recom-

mendations of the Poor Law Commissioners in 1834. They provided for loans to deserving men in time of distress, attaching the wages of the same on the return of work.[3] And, further, the Commissioners continued as follows :

"We recommend, therefore, that the Central Board be empowered to incorporate parishes for the purpose of appointing and paying permanent officers, and for the execution of works of public labour."[4]

Under the Executive Commission afterwards appointed, road-work was provided for the outdoor relief of the Spitalfields weavers, which they largely undertook.

At the time of the cotton famine in Lancashire outdoor relief was provided in the form of earth-works, as sanitary works, for the relief of 40,000 men. A million and a half of money was lent to the local authorities by the Government for the execution of remunerative sanitary work. Seven thousand took the work; and the rest, with the assistance of friends and relations were otherwise provided for. A large part of sanitary drainage work is earth-work; and but for a change in the administration, such work to the amount of a million and a half of money would have been provided, and might now be provided by a return to the administrative principles formerly recommended.

A great amount of almsgiving, then, manifestly resulted from the refusal or discontinuance of such employment of labour.

[3] Report of Commissioners, &c., p. 337. Fellowes, 1834.
[4] Report, p 326

But, further, there was a second consequence from the changed administration of the Poor Law. As the large return to almsgiving sprang from this change, so the existence of the Charity Organisation Society sprang from the profuse giving of alms. It was said that of the five millions two were devoured by the administrators or distributors; there was constant overlapping, so that money was given by several persons or societies to the same person or case, and to most undeserving.

The Charity Organisation Society arose with these chief attributes. First, to promote correspondence and co-operation among the many beneficent societies, so that their alms should not be wasted by overlapping and relieving the same case twice over.

Secondly, for the detection of impostors who were obtaining help under false pretences; living as paupers, and refusing to work for their bread.

Thirdly, to assist the deserving in time of transient distress, either by gift or by loan. This part of the Society's work is most wise and charitable. It is in the spirit of the Acts of Elizabeth and of the recommendations of the Commission in 1834.

Fourthly, to oversee the cases of poverty brought before them, and to aid, both by help and by advice, those who were striving to maintain or to retrieve their state.

All these are excellent offices of true and prudent charity. There may be others unknown to me, but these were the motives which induced me to become a member of the Society at its outset. So long as it is co-extensive with the whole field of poverty, and adequately

supplied with means, large-hearted in promoting all prudent agencies of relief, and free from the narrowness of doctrinaires, it must be regarded as a valuable supplement of the legal and mechanical operation of the Poor Law. They are both needed, and neither without the other could cover the whole area of poverty. Moreover, it is necessary that voluntary and personal service without hire or reward should be added to the legal administration of relief. In point of education, intelligence, and perseverance, the members of the Charity Organisation Society are of the highest efficiency.

The words, "I am a man, and everything human to me is as my own," ran through the old Latin world like an electric spark. They were written by an emancipated slave who had known sorrow. "Love your neighbour as yourself," was spoken by One Who made Himself a servant and the man of sorrows for our sakes. Compassion is fellow-feeling, and a share in the sufferings of others. If the commonwealth of Israel was pervaded by pity for poverty, and compassion for sorrow, what ought to be the large and watchful compassion of England for its people? It is a Christian people. It believes in Him Who said "I have compassion on the multitude." There is no doubt that in every great city there will be a refuse of the population who, through their own perverse will, blind conscience, and evil passions, gather together into a demoralised and dangerous horde. But it is also certain that each was once an innocent child. The bloated and brutal man, if he had been nurtured by a loving mother in a pure home fit for man to live in; if he had grown up in the con-

sciousness of a Divine law and presence; if he had lived in honest labour, found as a rule in the labour market, or as an exception, in times of distress, provided by the compassion of a wise charity, or of a law wisely and charitably administered—he would not have become the wreck in body, mind, and speech, which we may see in our streets every day. If parents, teachers, pastors, had been faithful, if the legislation and administration of public and social law had been conceived and carried out, not with a view to money or to enrichment, or to retrenchment, but for the moral and domestic life of the people, though some men will always wreck themselves, society would not be guilty of the ruin of its offspring. When society is sound, it sustains individuals who are falling. When society declines, it pulls down individuals in its fall. A commonwealth in which domestic life is perishing has a settlement in its foundations.

If, then, the worthless are what they are because the society of to-day has wrecked them, what is society doing, or willing to do, to redeem and save the worthless? None are so bad that there is not still a hope. But the class of men and youths who came into open day some weeks ago are not to be bettered by neglect, much less by defiance. Goodness will overcome evil, and kindness will break the hardest hearts. If the confidence of the worthless and dangerous could be won, it would be like the warmth of the sun breaking up a frost. The poor youths of eighteen and nineteen may be bad, but they are not yet hardened in evil. Are they to be left to become hopeless criminals? Surely

there are men and women ready to go among them. Human sympathy, kind care, personal service, patient goodwill, are powers which never fail. If, through faults of ours, however remotely or indirectly, by commission or omission, they are outcasts, let us now begin and try to bring them back to what once they were. The memory of their childhood is not dead within them: if it be only as a gleam of innocence long lost, it is also a throb of a higher life not yet extinct for ever.

XV.

HENRY VIII. AND THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES.

(*Dublin Review* 1888.)

HENRY VIII. AND THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES.

De Maistre said truly that history for three hundred years has been in conspiracy against the Catholic Church. The Protestant historians of Germany, France, England, and Scotland have written a mass of falsified history and falsified biography, which reigned supreme and unchallenged until our day. A reaction at last set in. In Germany, Schegel, Hurter, Ranke, Döllinger, and many more; in France, Montalembert, Ozanam, de Broglie, Rohrbacher, and others; in England, Lingard, Tytler, Hallam, and Friedmann, have broken the spell of historical falsehood. Maitland, in his book on the Dark Ages, was the first to expose the persistent unfaithfulness of anti-Catholic historians, who handed on, with continual embellishment and exaggeration, a multitude of original fables. Perhaps no greater example of this immoral practice can be found than in the history of the dissolution of the monasteries in England.

With this view Father Gasquet has written the first volume of his book on "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries," a work of singular and standard worth. It has three distinct qualities of excellence, of which the first is its wide research. Father Gasquet, for the last years, has been a laborious student in the

edited and unedited records of the British Museum. He has also industriously examined the MSS. of the Record Office, and has drawn his matter from sources hitherto not consulted, viz. Episcopal Registers, as of York, Bath and Wells, &c. He is careful to acknowledge the great courtesy and kindness which he has uniformly received from all the public officials of these archives. His work, therefore, is solid, authentic, trustworthy in its matter. Secondly, he has made his history tell its own tale. The profuse citations from all manner of documents, public and private, and from the innumerable letters of the prime agents in the dissolution of the monasteries, make his book not so much an impeachment against them, as a spontaneous confession of their guilt. They appear before us bearing the rod or the halter of their own sentence. In this his work may be compared to Paul Friedmann's *Anne Boleyn*. A third and last excellence of the book is the disappearance of the author. The history speaks for itself in clear, simple, and good English.

It is not easy to give any adequate representation of a work so full of facts, events, and characters; nevertheless, its outline may be given as follows:

The purpose in view is to clear the monasteries of England of the multitudinous crimes which for three hundred years have been laid to their charge.

To do this the author has examined the quality of the witnesses, the veracity of the documents, and the character of the chief agents. He sums up his case in the words of Edmund Burke, who said: "It is not with much credulity that I listen to any when they

speak ill of those whom they are going to plunder. I rather suspect that vices are feigned or exaggerated when profit is looked for in the punishment. An enemy is a bad witness, a robber is a worse."

Father Gasquet has wisely begun his task by tracing out a series of events which rendered possible the despotic acts of Henry VIII. He begins by pointing out the vast change which passed upon the social state of England by the ravages of the Black Death. Though one hundred and fifty years elapsed before Henry VIII. came to the throne, nevertheless its effects were still perceptible. In the years 1348-9 about one-half of the entire population were swept away. In Norwich alone 57,304 people, besides religious and beggars, were said to have died, and 863 incumbents of livings died. Out of 799 priests in the county of Norfolk, 527 died of the plague. The Bishop obtained from Clement VI. power to dispense with sixty clerks who were then only twenty-one years old, and allow them to hold livings; one thousand livings had been rendered vacant; two-thirds of the clergy of England had been carried off by the Black Death. The effect of this was to produce a crisis between the labourers and their employers; permanent retainers of the nobles and of the monasteries had disappeared, and the modern system of letting had been introduced. Peasant proprietors were greatly reduced in number, and the people were no longer bound to the lords of the land by the old ties. This destroyed the power of the nobles and exalted that of the King. The poverty and distress following upon the diminution of labour and of agriculture, and the suspension of reli-

gious care and teaching caused by the sudden removal of a great multitude of the clergy, had disastrous effects. Upon this followed all the evils of thirty-five years of warfare between the Houses of York and Lancaster. The power of the nobles was completely broken, and the power of the King became sole and supreme. Two evils followed upon this. First, the creation of new peers in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, who had no sympathy, by birth or training, with the traditions of the past; and secondly, the rise of a new race of men—viz. the "officials," adventurers, ill-paid, restless, discontented, and grasping. Their whole hope and dependence was in the King, and they became ready tools of his despotic will.

All these preludes made it possible for such a career as that of Thomas Wolsey. As the favourite of the King and Lord High Chancellor of England, he gradually clothed himself with all the powers of the State, and by the favour of the King he obtained all the highest powers of the Church, one only excepted. He was Archbishop of York, and held Winchester and other bishoprics *in commendam*, together with the Abbey of St. Albans. He was Cardinal and Legate, and during the imprisonment of Clement VIII. he obtained faculties for himself and for the King of France to confirm all kinds of ecclesiastical matters with a quasi-Papal authority. For the first time in the history of England such civil and ecclesiastical powers were united in one person. The transfer of the same *in globo* afterwards to Henry VIII. followed almost as a matter of course by the Statute of 1534.

It must not be forgotten that at this time the minds of men had been so distracted by the great Western Schism, by the frequent subtraction of obedience, by the doubtful election of Popes, and the simultaneous existence of two or even three claimants to the Holy See, that the supreme pontifical authority had become a matter of academical discussion *hinc inde*. Nothing but such preludes could have instigated even Gerson to write on the thesis *de Auferibilitate Papæ*. This throws much light on the singular fact attested by Sir Thomas More, in speaking to the jury and the judge by whom he was condemned when the verdict of death was brought in against him. "I have, by the grace of God, been always a Catholic, never out of communion with the Roman Pontiff, but I have heard it said at times that the authority of the Roman Pontiff was certainly lawful and to be respected, but still an authority derived from human law and not standing upon a Divine prescription. Then when I observed that public affairs were so ordered that the sources of the power of the Roman Pontiff would necessarily be examined, I gave myself up to a most diligent examination of that question for the space of seven years, and found that the authority of the Roman Pontiff, which you rashly—I will not use stronger language—have set aside, is not only lawful, to be respected, and necessary, but also grounded on the Divine law and prescription. That is my opinion; that is the belief in which, by the grace of God, I shall die.' Already in those days the name Papist was used as a reproach.

Wolsey was the first to set the example of suppress-

ing monasteries for the purpose of founding a college at Oxford. The King followed his example in asking to suppress monasteries for the foundation of new cathedrals. Men were, therefore, prepared for such a policy.

Whatever faults may be charged against the career of Wolsey, there is a grandeur about it, in his prosperity, and in his fall. Few things in our history are more pathetic than the suddenness with which he fell. The tyranny of Henry VIII. was Oriental. His favour was life, his displeasure was death. Surrounded by enemies, watched day and night by spies, betrayed by those he trusted most, the great Cardinal and Chancellor found himself in a day stripped of all power, banished from Court, and solitary in his own house. Mr. Brewer has written this history with a worthy compassion. The few months of Wolsey in the archbishopric of York, visiting his churches, confirming children, and living among the poor, was a beautiful picture of Christian humility, and the best preparation for the end that awaited him at Leicester on the way to the Tower. The fall of Wolsey was the fall of an ecclesiastical period. The next Lord High Chancellor of England was Thomas More, and with him came in the lay world which has reigned more and more until this day. It is strange that the first layman that kept the King's conscience should have died a martyr for resisting the Royal lusts.

The martyrdom of Blessed Thomas More made way for a man as bad and as base as the King and the times demanded.

Thomas Crumwell is said to be the son of a blacksmith at Putney. He was, it seems, for some offence, thrown into prison, and obliged to leave the country. Then he was a common soldier in Italy. He was, as it was believed, in the army of the Duke of Bourbon, which in 1527 sacked Rome and imprisoned Clement VII. It is said that among those who outraged Rome was "an Englishman of low, vicious habits and infidel principles, who afterwards became of terrific importance in the Church of England." Crumwell told Cranmer "that he had been at one time a ruffian." Then he became a merchant, a scrivener, a money-lender, a lawyer, a member of Parliament, a courtier and dependent of Wolsey, a dealer in "Boston pardons," and a disciple of Machiavelli, whose works he studied while he was in Italy. The history of his rise and iniquities verifies the Italian proverb—

"Inglese Italianatò
E Diavolo Incarnato."

Henry VIII., when at cards, if a knave was dealt to him, used to say, "I have Crumwell."

When Wolsey fell, Crumwell had to take careof himself, for the people had already consigned him to the gallows. It was believed that he saved himself by destroying his master—that is, by stealing and delivering to the King the royal permission, under the great seal, whereby Wolsey had exercised his legatine powers. Certain it is that Wolsey, not being able to produce this document, was in *præmunire*, and compelled to throw himself on the King's mercy. This was final and fatal. All the Cardinal's possessions were

forfeited, but Cromwell retained, by royal leave, the administration of them. In this office he made himself profitable to certain nobles; and from that time his rise was rapid. He became Master of the Jewels, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Master of the Rolls, Secretary of State, Vicar-General of the King in ecclesiastical matters, Lord Privy Seal, Dean of Wells, High Chamberlain. In 1533 he was knighted, then made Earl of Essex. In 1534 the King had made himself, by Act of Parliament, Head of the Church in all matters, spiritual and temporal. In all this usurped power Thomas Cromwell was Vicar-General, and, in fact, the sole executive of this twofold supremacy, ecclesiastical and civil.

The suppression of monasteries was, as we have seen, no new thing in England. Edward I. and Edward II. seized the alien priories; Edward III. re-established them, but took them into his own hand; Henry V. finally suppressed them all. William of Wykhame founded New College with ecclesiastical property. Winchester, Eton, and King's College, Cambridge, were likewise endowed by suppressed religious houses. Out of suppressed houses Chicheley endowed All Souls in Oxford; Waynfleet founded Magdalen College; Bishop Alcock founded Jesus College, in Cambridge. Bishop Fisher advised the dissolution of Brome Hall, in the diocese of Salisbury, and Lille Church, in his own diocese of Rochester; but all these suppressions were made with the sanction of the Holy See. In like manner afterwards, Wolsey suppressed many monasteries for the purpose of founding

Christ Church, in Oxford, and a college in Ipswich. Henry VIII. at first opposed Wolsey's suppressions, but afterwards, to supply his own needs, followed his example; and this he carried out by the instrumentality of Thomas Crumwell. Wolsey had before employed Thomas Crumwell and Dr. Allen for the same purpose, so that the work was not new to him. But he added to it all the aggravations of corruption, cruelty, and hypocrisy. The royal treasury was empty, and no readier source for its replenishment than the robbery of the monasteries was at hand. The Vicar-General, therefore, in the year 1535, began by issuing injunctions, which it was impossible for the monasteries to accept, for the purpose of driving them either to rebellion or to surrender. The first article of these injunctions was the declaration of the King's headship over the Church. Finding the Carthusians and the Franciscans firm in refusing this act of apostasy, every form of persecution, from the intrusion of strangers into their community, the violation of rule, the sowing of dissension between subjects and superiors, and finally imprisonment, with torture, the rack, and the axe, were inflicted on them.

Then for the visitation of monasteries throughout England four memorable persons were appointed by Crumwell as his agents—viz. Leyton, Leigh, Ap Rice, and London. The insolence, avarice, and servility of these men is proved in their own letters to Crumwell, of which sufficient proofs will be given hereafter.

When this iniquitous mockery of a visitation was drawing to a close, the Parliament was assembled to

carry the Act of Suppression. The writs for the election of members were sent out with the names of the persons to be elected. In the election at Canterbury two burgesses were returned contrary to the pleasure of the King, and the mayor was compelled to cancel the election, and to send the two royal nominees. In like manner, in summoning the House of Lords, peers that were not of the King's mind were passed over. Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, was advised, on account of his age and infirmities, not to expose himself to the long journey from Durham. Nevertheless, he set out, but on his way was met by a royal letter that sent him home again. But even this packed Parliament would not do the King's pleasure:

"On Saturday in Ember week the King's Grace came in among the Burgesses of the Parliament, and delivered them a Bill, and bade them look upon it, and weigh it in conscience. He would not, he said, have them pass it nor any other thing, because his Grace giveth them the Bill, but they to see to it if it be for the common weal to his subjects, and have an eye thitherward, and on Wednesday next he will be there again to hear their minds."

The preamble of the Bill asserts that, in consideration of the evil lives of those in the smaller monasteries, the King's most royal Majesty . . . . having knowledge that the premises be true, as well as by the *compertes* of his late visitation as by sundry credible informations; considering also that divers and great solemn monasteries of this realm, wherein, thanks be to God, religion is right well kept and observed, &c. . . . . Whereupon the said Lords and Commons, by a great deliberation, finally be resolved that it is, and shall be,

much more to the pleasure of Almighty God that the property of these Religious should be converted to better uses, and "the unthrifty persons so spending the same should be compelled to reform their lives;" therefore they pray the King to take all the property of monasteries having an income of under 200*l.* a year. And even this limited submission was not obtained without threats which destroyed all liberty of action. Sir Henry Spelman tells us as follows:

"It is true the Parliament gave them (*i.e.* the monasteries) to him, but so unwillingly, as I have heard, that when the Bill had stuck long in the Lower House, and could get no passage, he commanded the Commons to attend him in the forenoon in his gallery, where he let them wait till late in the afternoon; and then coming out of his chamber, walking a turn or two among them, and looking angrily upon them, first on the one side and then on the other. 'At last, I hear,' sayth he, 'that my Bill will not pass, or I will have some of your heads.'"

And here we have an example of a tradition which has been handed on without hesitation and with embellishment by anti-Catholic writers for which no foundation in history can be found. It has been said by all writers, from Burnett to Dean Stanley, that the "Black Book," detailing the crimes of the monasteries, was laid before the Parliament in the Chapter House of Westminster. Dean Stanley tells us "that on the table of the Chapter House was placed the famous 'Black Book' which sealed the fate of all the monasteries of England, and sent a thrill of horror through the House of Commons when they heard it." Now, no such book has ever been found, and there is not a shred of contemporary evidence to prove that such a "Black Book" ever existed. The preamble of the Act of Suppression cites

the "knowledge of the King, the *comperta* of the Visitation, and credible informations." The following is the summary of the evidence against the monasteries:

"In the *comperta* and letters which report as to the monasteries of a considerable portion of England, scarcely 250 monks and nuns are named as guilty of incontinence. In the same districts the religious must have numbered many thousands. Of these 250, more than a third part can be identified as having subsequently received pensions upon the dissolution of their houses, a fact which even Burnett would consider as disproving the charge in their regard. Of the entire number of convents of women visited and reported upon by Leyton and Leigh in the north, they are able to relate very little amiss. Only some twenty-seven nuns in all are charged with vice, and of these seventeen are known to have been afterwards pensioned. Further, in their whole visitation, extending over thirteen counties, they only report that some fifty men and two women were anxious to abandon the religious life, even under the restrictions imposed by Cromwell's injunctions."[1]

This summary accumulates the worst that can be found in the reports of the visitors. All those who have had experience of what popular allegations are worth will know how to estimate the figures and the charges above given. But where in this is the "Black Book"?

The wealth of the English monasteries was undoubtedly great. It had accumulated for centuries by the gifts of the devout as their freewill offerings, and of the penitent in reparation for their sins, and for the relief of the poor. The monasteries were a thousand in number, and they possessed a third of the land in England. In the reign of Edward I. the soil of England consisted of 67,000 knights' fees, of which eccle-

[1] *Henry VIII.*, &c., pp 252-3.

siastics held about 28,000. They were, as a rule, good and kind landlords. It was a proverb that it was better to be under the crosier than under the lance. The tenants of the abbeys and priories were a contented race, and the abbey gate was ever open to the needs and the sufferings of the poor. It is a mistake to say that the poor were provided for by the doles of the monasteries, for they were to be found only in a third of the land of England; but they were a thousand centres of constant beneficence; and in the other two-thirds of the land the palaces of the Bishops, the homes of the clergy, the castles of the nobles, and the houses of the faithful maintained all the year round the Christian law of almsgiving. There was poverty in England because there were old age and sickness, and the vicissitudes of life and fortune. But there was everywhere the faith which honoured the poor as the brethren of Christ, and the charity which spontaneously ministered to Him in them. Then came the robbery of God and His poor. By the Act of Suppression:

"The monasteries were given to the King and his heirs only 'in as ample a manner' as they were possessed by the religious superiors. These were trustees for common purposes, and never regarded their property in any other light than as held for the support of religion and the poor. Further, the purpose for which the monastic property was diverted by this Act from its possessors and given to the King is stated to be 'that his Highness may lawfully give, grant, and dispense them or any of them at his will and pleasure to the honour of God and the wealth of this realm.' . . . . It was further enacted that on the site of every dissolved religious house the new possessor should be bound, under heavy penalties, to provide hospitality and service for the poor, such as had been given them previously by the religious foundations. . . . . The repudiation of these rights of

the needy by those who became possessed of the confiscated property is one of the greatest blots on our national history. It has caused the spoliation of monastery and convent to be regarded as the rising of the rich against the poor."[2]

It has been the fashion of political economists to describe the demoralisation of the poor by the alms of the monasteries, and to cite in proof the statutes against "sturdy beggars" and the like; but we have it upon a high economical authority "that the fifteenth century and the first quarter of the sixteenth were the golden age of the English labourer, if we are to interpret the wages which he earned by the cost of the necessaries of life."[3] When the greater monasteries had been plundered and wrecked, and the Church had been robbed, the poverty of England began. The faith and charity, that is, the Christianity, of the people had so rapidly declined as to need the intervention of public law. The Bishops and clergy were commanded to stir up the charity of the rich to keep the poor, but with so little result that by 5 Eliz. c. 3 the relief of the poor was made compulsory, and England for the first time had a Poor Law. For two centuries this law was administered with a recognition of its natural justice; but for the last fifty years it has been the butt of all kind of denouncement. Nevertheless, it has saved the land laws of England until now, and perhaps few are conscious how powerfully but surely it has guarded our social peace. The foresight of S. Thomas of Canterbury made him defend the goods of the Church as

[2] *Henry VIII.*, &c., pp 310-11.

[3] *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* (p. 326), by James Thorold Rogers.

the patrimony of the poor. We see at this day the twofold poverty, temporal and spiritual, which the Tudors inflicted upon the people of England. It was not so much the Church as the poor whom they robbed of their inheritance.

Crumwell's tyranny lasted eight years. His account-book shows the immense wealth accumulated by private and public extortion. "Archbishops, Bishops, abbots, priors, nobles, commoners, officials, unknown laymen, towns, colleges, cathedral chapters, all sent fees and new year's donations to propitiate the favour of the great man."[4] For instance, in January 1539, 9000*l.*—gifts of 10*l.*, 50*l.*, and 300*l.*, and 100*l.*, and 266*l.*—came from all over the country; for the elections at Fountains Gisboro', Whitby and many other places, large bribes are offered for nominations. "If he will make a certain monk Abbot of Vale Royal, he will be contented," writes Sir Piers Dutton, "to give you 100*l.* in hand, and further to do you as much pleasure as any man shall."[5] William Hennison wishes to be receiver at the dissolution of Reading Abbey, and presents a diamond, "set in a gold ring, meet to be set in the breast of a George." The Abbot of Miravale writes: "That he learns from Dr. Legh that Crumwell is looking for the 40*l.* promised to you for his trouble in my regard. I have already paid 100*l.*" The Abbot of Pipwell will do all that a poor man can to gratify your lordship with 200*l.* To avert the dissolution of Colchester, Crumwell was offered 24,000*l.* The Abbot of Leicester sends 40*l.*

[4] *Henry VIII.*, &c., pp. 413, 414, 420.
[5] Ibid. pp. 414-5.

His successor had to pay a yearly tax of 240*l.*: and so on for pages. As for presents, of a brace of fat oxen and a score of fat wethers, fish from Croyland, apples from King's Langley, partridges and pheasants from Harrow, Irish hawks from Bath, and 40*l.* from one John Hunter towards furnishing your cellar with wine, in recompense for Crumwell's part in a law case relating to the property of John Hunter's wife. Then again, "money in a purse," "in a white leather purse," "in a crimson sateen purse," "in a handkerchief," "in a glove," "at Arundel in a glove," "in a pair of gloves under a cushion in the middle window of the gallery." "A chain melted for my lord worth more than 5000*l.*" His notebook shows as follows: "Item, to remember Warren for one monastery. Mr. Gostwyke for a monastery. John Freeman for Spalding. Mr. Kingsmill for Wherwell. *Myself* for Lunde. Item, to remember John Godsall for something for he hath need; and Item, to remember to know the true value of the goods at Castle Acre *for my part thereof*."[6]

Then follow cups and ewers and trenchers of gold, platters and dishes and salters of silver by the dozen, and the gold cross of St. Albans, worth 100*l.* But this is endless. Maitland writes that he was "the great patron of ribaldry, and the protector of the ribald, of the low jester, of the filthy ballad-monger, of the ale-house singers, and hypocritical mockers at feasts—in short, of all the blasphemous mocking and scoffing which disgraced the Protestant party at the time of the Reformation."

[6] *Henry VIII.*, &c., p. 420.

The fall of Wolsey was full of dignity, and moved men to compassion. The fall of Crumwell had no sign of dignity, and no man wept for him. We have it in all its details. "By a Nemesis of fate he passed to the scaffold suddenly and almost untried, and certainly unheard in his own defence." This was probably by an Act devised or obtained by himself.

On June 11, 1540, the French Ambassador wrote that he had heard, an hour before sending his despatch, that Crumwell had been sent to the Tower. On June 23 he gave full information. He says that Crumwell was altogether unprepared for his downfall. When the Lieutenant of the Tower entered the Council Chamber at Westminster and informed him that he was ordered to take him prisoner, Crumwell, moved with indignation, threw his hat on the floor. Some of the Council called out that he was a traitor, and must be judged by the laws he had himself made. The Duke of Norfolk tore the Order of St. George from his neck, and the Garter was also taken from him. Before the news spread he was already in the Tower, and the people knew of his arrest by seeing the King's officers enter to search his house. By the next day the King had already begun to distribute his fallen favourite's offices, and sent an officer through the streets of London publicly forbidding any one to call him Lord Privy Seal, or by any other title or dignity, but simply Thomas Crumwell, cloth carder; and that the King had taken from him every privilege and title of nobility which he had ever granted him. His attainder declares him to be a false and corrupt traitor, selling for manifold sums of money

various grants, even to foreigners and aliens. And, further, as Vice-regent under the Great Seal, he licensed divers persons, detected and suspected of heresy, openly to preach and teach, saying that he would fight even against the King to maintain these heresies. His arrest was so sudden that he could destroy no papers. On the morning of June 10, 1540, he was supreme in England; in the evening he was in the Tower. On June 28 he was brought to the scaffold on Tower Hill.

Such was the end of the master; it only remains to give the end of the minions. They had not even the dignity of the axe. These were Dr. Richard Layton, Thomas Legh, John Ap Rice, and Dr. John London.[7]

It is not impossible, says Mr. Blunt, a Protestant, in his *History of the Reformation*, that even such bad men may have told the truth in this matter. But the character of witnesses must always form an important element in estimating the value of their testimony, and the character of such obscene, profligate, and perjured witnesses as Layton and London could not well be worse. These men were not just Lots, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked, but filthy dreamers, who defiled the flesh, despised ecclesiastical dominion, and spake evil of dignitaries in the very spirit of the Evil One. Dr. Layton was a pluralist by the favour of Cromwell. Cromwell was invited by him to his rectory at Harrow in these words: "Surely, Simeon was never so glad to see Christ, his Master, as I shall be to see your

[7] *Henry VIII.*, &c., p. 443.

lordship." He offered Crumwell 100*l.* to make him Chancellor of the diocese of Salisbury; and when made Dean of York, he pawned the plate belonging to the Minster.

It is evident from Layton's letters to Crumwell that he had made up his mind beforehand what he intended to find in the monasteries that he visited. Moreover, it was absolutely impossible, in the time given by the visitors, to hold any inquiry, worthy of the name, in the numberless monasteries, especially in the north, which were visited in the most hurried way. The insolence, violence, and falsehood of Layton and Legh made the Pilgrims of Grace demand their instant and condign punishment.

Next we find Dr. Layton scampering over Sussex, and writing to Crumwell as follows: "On Friday night I came into Sussex to an abby called Durtford, it might better be called Dirtyford. Then to an abbey . . . . towards Chichester, because of their poverty not able to lodge. These two poor priories we will dispatch on Monday by the way. And so on Monday night we shall be at Chichester."[8] He then describes his treatment of the Abbot of Waverley. He took away the keys of office from all the monks, and made new officers, "perchance as stark knaves as the others. It shall be expedient for me to give the Abbot a lesson, and tell the poor fool what he should do amongst the monks."[9]

Of the monastery of Lewes, Layton reports: "At Lewes I found the monks morally bad, and traitors, and, having intimidated the Prior on his knees with the

[8] *Henry VIII.*, &c., p. 268. [9] Ibid. p. 268.

worst words I could devise, I ordered him to appear before you, and you will be able to do what you like with him." [10]

From Lewes he went to Battle. He writes as follows: "The Abbot of Battle is the 'Varast bette,' and huserde and the arants chorle that I ever see. In all other places whereat I come, especially the black sort of develish monks, I am sorry to kum as I do. Surely, I thynk they be past amendment, and that God hath utterly withdrawn His grace from them." [11]

Dr. Layton sums up his own worth: "Praying God that rather I may be buried quick than to be the occasion why the King's Highness should diminish any part of the affiance of your proved mind towards His Grace."

So much for Dr. Layton—by his own showing, a bad, insolent, and unjust man.

We come next to Dr. Legh.

Ap Rice will save us trouble. He wrote to Cromwell a full indictment against his fellow commissioners. "First, in his going he is too insolent and pompalique . . . . Then he handleth the Fathers when he cometh very roughly. . . . The man is young and of an intolerable elation of mind. . . . For the election of the Prior of Coventry he took 15*l.*, at Revell 20*l.*, besides his costs, which is, in my opinion, too much. . . . . He maketh them to send after him such rewards as may please him." He went about with twelve men in livery besides his brother. After sending this letter, Ap Rice was frightened, and wrote next day to Crum-

[10] *Henry VIII.*, &c., p. 269. [11] Ibid. p. 270.

well, begging him not to tell Dr. Legh. "Forasmuch as the said Mr. Doctor is of such acquaintance and familiarity with many rufflers and serving men . . . . and I having commonly no great assistance with me when I go abroad, might take perchance irrecoverable harm of him or of his ere I were aware. Please keep secret what I have said." [12]

Sanders, writing almost at the same time, says: "Lee (Legh), indeed, in order to discharge correctly the duties laid upon him, tempted the religious to sin, and he was more ready to inquire into, and to speak about, uncleanness of living than anything else." [13]

No wonder the nuns were terrified at Mr. Doctor Legh, the familiar of rufflers, a prurient talker, if not also a tempter, and an accuser of the innocent.

As to Ap Rice, little need be said. He had the reputation of being an unfrocked priest. Legh accused him of some discreditable acts, and it appears that he never received any spiritual promotion for his services.

Dr. John London's case may be speedily summed up. Even Cranmer called him "the stout and filthy prebendary of Windsor." He and one Simons, a lawyer, "that set traps for others were catched at length themselves." They were condemned to ride through Windsor, Reading, and Newbury, their faces to the tails of their horses, and to stand in the pillory on a market-day, with a paper on their heads proclaiming their offence.

Once more, Mr. Blunt. with his usual justice, says: "A dean, twice detected in immorality and put to open

[12] *Henry VIII.*, &c., pp. 262-3. [13] Ibid. p. 266.

penance for it, and afterwards convicted of perjury, is not the stuff of which credible witnesses are made."

We may learn the worth of this precious quaternion from two safe sources—first, from their own words; and next, from what they said of each other.

Fuller says that the Catholics accused the visitors of employing profligate young men to tempt the nuns to sin, and tells a story of two young men going to a convent near Cambridge, but without success.

Mr. Blunt says again:

"The story has too much a *vraisemblance* to be set aside. And in addition to this, the tone of Layton's letters to Cromwell are of such a kind, as to make one fear that some nuns were, indeed, wickedly seduced, and others not less wickedly accused falsely. Those, however, who duly appreciate the character of their countrywomen, will believe that among these evil-entreated innocents there were not a few who passed through the scorching fire of temptation scathless, under the protection of their heavenly bridegroom. For the English daughters of the nineteenth century whom we see around us are sisters to the English nuns of the sixteenth, of whom we know only by vague tradition."[14]

Such then, most hastily and inadequately, is Father Gasquet's impeachment of Thomas Cromwell and his accomplices in the sins of sacrilege, robbery, cruelty, falsehood, incontinence, and perjury, whereby they spoiled and wrecked the monasteries of England, until the judgment of God fell upon them. The Black Book of their crimes was written by themselves. If

[14] *Reformation of Church of England*, vol. i. p. 316.

ever men were self-condemned they are. They stand for the first time at the bar of the just judgment of England. Father Gasquet has appealed from the falsehoods of distorted history to the *ipsissima verba* and mutual recriminations of this abandoned crew. Father Gasquet will obtain a verdict from all honest men. His pleading is too powerful in evidence to need passion or indignation. He has cited Crumwell and his gang to judgment, and out of their own mouths, and under their own hands, they stand convicted of falsehood, injustice, avarice, servility, and immoral deeds.

Upon the evidence of such wretches the highest sanctity and the noblest intellects of England were blackened and martyred. But upon the oaths of such men no just man would take even the life of a dog.

XVI.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND MODERN SOCIETY.

(*North American Review.*)

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND MODERN SOCIETY.

1. The object of this paper is not speculative and abstract, but strictly concrete and practical. It is to ascertain what can be, and what ought to be, the relations of the Church in the nineteenth century to the political society of the world in the nineteenth century.

2. These relations must be—(1) those of amity; or (2) of opposition; or (3) of a mixed character—that is, both of amity and of opposition.

I. First, let us understand what is meant by society, and then by modern society.

1. By society I mean the state of man, or of human life, in the natural order apart from faith. It has three degrees of formation or completeness, namely—(1) The domestic life; (2) the civil life; (3) the political life of a people or nation. Human society comprehends all these three stages or forms of life. They may be classed also more briefly as—(1) private life; and (2) public life: the private containing the domestic and social in its narrower sense, the public life containing the civil and political.

2. Now, neither mankind as a whole nor any integral portion of mankind, such as a people, race, or tribe, was ever yet a mere numerical multitude, without head, without social relations, or without authority.

"*Nos numerus sumus, et fruges consumere nati*," was never true. There were always relations of inequality, as of parentage, brotherhood, age, strength, mental and bodily, and therefore of subjection and authority, which constitute organisation.

3. Men were never all equal. The first principle of 1789 is false, and it is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of the nineteenth century.

4. There never was, and there never could be, an "original compact." The whole theory is a "*chimæra bombitans in vacuo*."

5. Mankind was never without organisation, and, therefore, never without subjection and authority. Every generation of men reproduces both these elements in the domestic life; and no civil or political life is possible without these conditions. It would be anarchy, and anarchy cannot last. It destroys itself by reaction, which again produces order and authority.

6. Authority, therefore, in an imperishable element in the condition and history of man. Authority is not of human creation. It is in itself Divine. When S. Thomas Aquinas and others say that authority is given by God immediately to society, and mediately by society to the one or to the many who bear it, he declares authority to be θεόδοτον—that is, from God—and in itself to be a Divine creation. This is the *crux* of modern society. It claims to create its own authority —that is, to be its own creator. Such also is S. Paul's declaration: "Let every soul be subject to higher powers, for there is no power but of God; and those that are, are ordained of God. Therefore, he that

resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation" (Romans xiii. 1, 2).

7. The theory of authority, as created by a delegation from the people, is therefore false. It is a negation of the truth, and an inversion of the intellectual and moral order of mankind. The people or society of men may designate the person, or the family, or the group of persons who shall bear authority, but they cannot create it; nor can they, when it is once impersonated, revoke it at their mere will.

8. Authority, as it exists among men, has for its root either right or might. It either devolves peacefully from sire to son, or it emerges from conflict in the hand of the strongest. Might in time becomes right, when confirmed by stability and permanence.

9. The authority of pure right is the most perfect, but perhaps it exists in unbroken devolution only in the sovereignty of the Vicar of Christ. Might is either the root or the renewal of every other authority in the world. But authority which begins in might becomes rightful in many ways, as in conquest followed by prescription, by voluntary cession, by immemorial possession, and the like.

10. But even the order which arises from might is better than anarchy. That a rightful sovereign be overturned is an evil, that society be overturned is worse. There is a time when loyalty to a dispossessed prince ceases to be a civic virtue; and when a legitimate prince cannot rightly attempt to recover his throne by force. If the attempt be easy of accomplishment, he may

attempt it; if it be morally impossible, he ought not to attempt it; if it be both possible and probable, he and his subjects must use their prudence and self-denial; if it be possible but not probable, he ought not to risk civil war, which, for an uncertain good, brings certain bloodshed and misery upon his people. A restoration is one more revolution, which may indeed be made for the welfare of a people, but not merely for the sake of a person. "*Reges propter regna, non regna propter reges.*"

11. A revolution is a period of anarchy which cannot last. Order by right or by might will put an end to anarchy, for anarchy is intrinsically destructive to the society of mankind. It is to society, what mortal disease is to the body.

12. But society is imperishable. Given man, society by necessity exists. Man out of society is inhuman; man never so existed. Society is necessary to man, and not only to his perfection, but to his human formation and development.

13. Historians say that a people is happy which has no history; for history is the narrative of wars and revolutions—that is, of the overthrows of authority and of order, and of the perpetual restoration of both.

14. Society, then, contains all the relations, bonds, and obligations of human life, domestic, civil, and political, and all the duties and affections which arise from those relations. Even Cicero could say, "*Omnes omnium charitates patria una complectitur,*" and S.

Thomas says that the objects of the "Donum Pietatis," or gift of piety, are "*parentes et patria*," our parents and our mother country.

15. From all this I infer that it is the duty of every member of a commonwealth to use his utmost power to hinder all evil, and to do all good he can to the state or people to which he belongs. These are positive and natural duties which he cannot fail to discharge without culpable omission, or, rather, without a dereliction, and betrayal of the highest natural duties, next after those which he owes immediately to God.

So much for society, roughly and in outline.

II. Next, few words are needed as to the Catholic Church.

1. The Catholic Church is the society of man in the supernatural order.

2. It is a perfect society in the fullest sense and extension of the term. It has authority, subjection, inequality, equality, relations, bonds, obligations, with all the duties and affections arising from them. S. Paul's analogy of the body of a man or of the human structure, with its unity of life, its symmetry, sympathy, mutual needs, and reciprocal service of all its members, is not only a metaphor, but a philosophy. If sociology were capable of a scientific sense, it would be the philosophy of society.

3. As natural society develops man in the natural order, so the Church perfects man both in the natural and in the supernatural order.

4. But the Church not only perfects man or individuals, both in nature and in grace; it perfects the

natural society of man also, in all its relations of public and private life.

5. The Church elevates, preserves, and perfects the domestic and public life of natural society. In Athens and in Rome, the two culminating points of natural civilisation, society had almost died out by the gangrene which had eaten away the domestic and moral life of men.

6. There is, therefore, a Divine obligation binding the Church to enter into the most intimate relations with the natural society or commonwealth of men, or, in other words, with peoples, states, and civil powers.

7. This is the principle implied in S. Paul's words in the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and in his injunction to Timothy, that prayers "be made for all men, for kings, and for all that are in high station, that we may lead a quiet and peaceful life" (I. Timothy ii. 1, 2).

8. And this is the cause why the Church has in every age striven to direct, not the life of individual men only, but the collective life of nations in their organised forms of republics, monarchies, and empires.

9. So long as the world was heathen, it could only convert individuals and sanctify households. The State was at war with the Church; there was a conflict of laws, and an irreconcilable conflict of aims and actions. No co-operation could exist between them.

10. As soon as the society of the empire became Christian, the Church penetrated all its legislative and executive action. The temporal power of the

Pontiffs is the providential condition under which the Church has fulfilled its mission to human society.

11. The domestic, civil, and political life of man became Christian, and the Church enveloped the natural society of man in its own unity.

12. The union of the two societies was so complete that, as a whole, every member of the empire was a member of the Church, and every member of the Church was a member of the empire. They were concentric, coextensive, and coincident.

13. The civil and ecclesiastical discipline was so coincident and concurrent that a heretic was "*vitandus*"—to be avoided by all citizens, as by all Christians. He not only forfeited his civil rights, but was put beyond the pale and commerce of human society. He was like the leper in Israel, whom no man could touch without becoming legally unclean. No man could give to the heretic fire or water.

14. When this coincidence ceased in part to exist, Pope Martin V., in the Council of Constance, relaxed the obligations of avoiding the inevitable commerce and contact with heretics in civil and political life. It was lawful to communicate with heretics in all things except only in religion. "*Communicatio in sacris*" is intrinsically evil. It involves at least implicit communion in heresy. But outside of that circle, which is Divine, the faithful could, without censure, converse and co-operate with their fellow-citizens in all lawful things of the political order.

15. The Church, therefore, continued to hold relations with those who had departed from the faith,

except when *nominally* excommunicated, that is, by name, in all things outside the faith itself.

16. But this divergence of the two societies was not any change on the part of the Church, which, by Divine guidance, is immutable. It was the falling away of men from the unity of the faith. And this divergence has extended itself continually for the last three hundred years.

17. Nevertheless, the Church never withdraws from the State as such, which would be to abandon the natural society of man to its own maladies and mortality.

18. It continues always to save and uphold it, and, without taking the contagion, it is in contact with its maladies, to heal them. For this cause, while it permits the sons of heretics to frequent its own schools, it, as Reiffenstuel, Ferraris, and other canonists show, forbids Catholic parents to send their sons to the schools of those who are out of the faith (Ferraris, *Bib. Can. Hæreticus* s. 19).

19. From this it is inferred:

(1) That perpetual hostility to the political order of any State is no duty of the Church, unless such political order should be intrinsically anti-Christian or anti-Catholic.

(2) That indiscriminate opposition to any political order is not lawful nor reasonable. Order as such is from God. Its disorders, revolutionary or anti-Christian, are maladies and transient conditions, which need to be opposed with a discriminating resistance, while the political order itself is respected and obeyed.

(3) That perpetual abstention from exercising the duties of citizens cannot be justified.

It is—1. An abdication of a natural duty.

2. A virtual and inevitable separation of Church and State, which is condemned in the Syllabus, that is, the separation of the two societies which God willed should be united, for the peace of the one and for the perfection of the other.

20. Therefore, in every society or commonwealth which may be suffering from temporary anarchy, or revolution, or conquest, or usurpation, the duty of using all civil powers and privileges still within reach for the welfare of the people, for the restoration of authority, and for the maintenance of order, is a Christian and a Catholic duty.

III. We now come to define what is meant by *modern* society.

1. Modern society is the old society of the Christian world mutilated by the character forced upon it by the last three hundred years :

(1) First, by the so-called Reformation, which, wheresoever it prevailed, destroyed the Catholic unity, and extinguished the Catholic mind of the Christian society.

(2) Secondly, by the principles of 1789, which were not a mere local formula of French opinion, but a dogmatic theory of revolution, promulgated by its pretentious authors for all nations. It has now, in fact, directly and indirectly pervaded the whole political society of modern Europe.

(3) Thirdly, by the recent international settlement, or law, which has admitted the kingdom of Italy, with Rome as capital, and therefore with the usurpation of the rights and sovereignty of the Pontiffs, into the commonwealth of European States; and, so far as any *jus gentium* now survives, into the diplomacy of Europe.

2. Modern society, therefore, is not the natural society of the world before Christianity, nor is it the society of Christendom, when the two societies were in amity, and coincidence of law and of intention. It is the political society of the natural order, fallen from the unity of faith, communion, and obedience to the Divine voice of the Church, revolutionary in its political creed and practice, and either in usurpation, or in culpable connivance at the usurpation, of the sacred rights and sovereignty of the Vicar of Christ.

IV. From these premisses it follows:

1. That the Catholic Church can only partially hold political relations with such States in Europe as have departed from the Catholic unity. They have either set up regalism, as in England, Denmark, and Sweden; or Cæsarism, as in Prussia. In so far as they have departed from the jurisprudence of Catholic Christendom, they have rendered relations of co-operation impossible. But the Church can still hold relations with the domestic, social, and civil life of those countries in all that is of the natural order of mankind.

2. That the Church can hold no relations with the revolutionary politics of France and Italy, in so far as they are founded upon the principles of 1789.

3. But that it can and ought always to hold rela-

tions with the commonwealths of those countries in all things of the natural order, and apart from their antagonism to the Divine law. In so far as these States put off their anti-Catholic and anti-Christian attitude toward the faith and the Church, in that measure they return to the state of simple natural society, with which the Church is not only able but is bound to maintain relations of amity and of co-operation.

4. It follows, further, that, in proportion as the civil powers of any State are under the dominion of an erroneous religion, or of a schism, or of an imperial despotism, or of a royal supremacy, or of a democratic despotism, or of an anti-Christian revolution, the Church can hold no relations with them. It cannot co-operate with or condone the Lutheran or Calvinistic heresies, or the Anglican schism, or the Thirty-nine Articles of Queen Elizabeth, or the Four Articles of 1682, or the Organic Articles of the First Napoleon, or the Russian Holy Ecclesiastical Synod, or the Falk Laws, and the like. But under all these there lies the commonwealth of natural society in all its domestic, social, and civil relations. With this in all the regions of its life, and conditions of its welfare, the Church sympathises and co-operates for the common good—and that because even towards such States as these the Church has duties, such as (1) first, to guard and to conserve all of Christian faith and morals that still remains in them; (2) secondly, to minimise all the evils of their legislation or government; and (3) thirdly, to recall them by all influences to a better condition.

5. In proportion as the civil powers release themselves from the dominion and perversion of the influences which are antagonistic to the Church and hostile to the faith—in proportion, that is, as the State returns to its purely and simply natural order—the repulsions and barriers which made unity and co-operation impossible will cease to exist, and the Church can then draw its relations more and more closely and intimately to the national commonwealth. Such is, in the main, the condition of the Catholic Church in the United States.

6. The best example I know of a commonwealth which has lost its Catholic perfection, without losing its traditional but imperfect Christianity, and has at the same time returned in great part to the natural order—that is, to the truths of natural religion and to the four cardinal virtues—may be said to be the British Empire, and especially in some of its more recent colonies. There exists in it nowhere at this time a penal law in matters of religion. The Catholic Church has all its spiritual liberties; no man can be molested for his faith. There exists, so far as I know, no bar to the participation of Catholics in any of the regions of national life, domestic, social, civil, and political, excepting only the Crown and the office of High Chancellor, in England. With few exceptions, such as the Divorce Court and the presentation to livings in the Established Church, and the like, there is, so far as I remember, no branch of the public life and service of our commonwealth into which a Catholic with a safe conscience cannot enter. He may sit in Parliament,

he may dispense justice in Westminster Hall, he may serve and command in the army and navy, he may hold any civil or political office under Government, he may partake in the whole world of finance and commerce. There is nothing outside of the unity of the faith and of the Church into which a Catholic in the British Empire may not be a citizen and a patriot, as there is nothing within that unity in which he can yield a hair's breadth without betraying his fidelity, and deserving the worst of names, or at least that of a liberal Catholic.

V. 1. If, then, the Church be bound by its Divine mission to conserve, to consecrate, and to co-operate with the natural society of man, then the withdrawal of Catholics from the active service of the commonwealth, and the non-fulfilment of the duties of citizens and patriots, is a dereliction of duty, and unlawful in itself.

2. In England, so long as penal laws excluded Catholics from all careers of civil and political life, there was no doubt as to their duty. Catholics had only to maintain inflexibly their unity of faith. It is not, perhaps, to be wondered at that they regarded the civil powers—and the whole nation—as antagonists, with whom they could hardly hold any relations of amity or of co-operation.

3. Nor is it, perhaps, a wonder that, after the abolition of penal laws, the same antagonism should continue as a personal sentiment, and that Catholics should feel no ambition and no desire, perhaps even no willingness, to enter into the careers of civil and political life. Such is the feeling of many among the faithful

Irish race, who can not forget or forgive the wrongs of their past history. It is no wonder, but it is a disaster, for thereby the whole administration of the commonwealth is left in the hands—I will not say of antagonists, but—of their non-Catholic countrymen. The penal laws have been abolished for half a century, but as yet Catholics are only entering slowly into civil careers, and no Catholic holds any political office of importance. The whole constituency of England, Scotland, and Wales does not return a single Catholic to Parliament. Twenty years ago Catholics could hardly be induced to sign a petition to Parliament, or to take part in any public movements, even of national beneficence. This was an unwise abstention, and cancelled their weight in the public action of the country. It was socially and civilly *la politique d'effacement*, which their enemies most desired to perpetuate.

4. In France, inasmuch as the whole population, less only about one million out of thirty-eight, is nominally Catholic, the public life of the nation is in the hands of Catholics. Nevertheless, in every political election, the abstention of a large proportion of voters, including the peaceful, the unambitious, and the retiring, who are also for the most part certainly Catholics, has left the effective government of France in the hands of the anti-clerical parties, who are also exaggerated Republicans, and without faith at least, if they be not formally anti-Christian. And this evil has been greatly aggravated by the divisions and rivalries among the sections of the Conservative party, in which, if anywhere, the sounder Catholic politicians are, or ought to be,

found. The sympathies of Catholics are rather with monarchy, Royal or Imperial, than with Republicanism; but the Imperialists and the Legitimists being divided, the whole control of the political life of France is left to the Republican party, which contains within itself an extreme section, subversive of all relations between the commonwealth of France and the Catholic Church. It must be borne in mind that the Republicanism of France is not the Republicanism of Switzerland nor of the United States. If the last outlines of the Catholic tradition of France are to be preserved in its civil and political order, it can only be done by a complete union of all the Conservative sections against their direct and natural antagonist—namely, the anti-Christian animosity of French Republicanism. While Imperialists and Orleanists and Legitimists are contending in the vain hope of impossible restorations, the anti-clerical and anti-Christian party is becoming numerous, organised, and dominant. It is at this moment striving for the supremacy and the lead of the Republican majority in the Chamber and the Senate, and this once attained, it will dominate over all political opposition and dictate the secularisation of all education, from the universities to the primary schools, the abolition of the budget of the clergy, including the subvention to the seminaries, the withdrawal of chaplains from the army and the navy, and the complete dechristianisation of the whole civil and political order of France. The France of S. Louis would then become not the United States of America, which are just and tolerant in religion, but the France of Voltaire and Rousseau.

But into this subject, which I give only as an illustration, I will not enter further. I will conclude by reciting the teaching of Leo XIII. in the Encyclical of 1878. Leo XIII. affirms the Divine origin of authority by drawing out a beautiful analogy of the Divine monarchy in the celestial and ecclesiastical hierarchies: "It is plain the Church does wisely in impressing upon the people subject to authority the apostolic precept: 'There is no power but from God, and those that are ordained of God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation.' And again he admonishes those 'subject by necessity' to be so 'not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake,' and to render to all men their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour, for He who created and governs all things, has, in His wise providence, ordained that all should occupy their proper places, the lower beneath the middle, and the middle below the highest. As, therefore, in the heavenly kingdom itself He has decreed that there should be distinct orders of angels, some subject to others, and as in the Church He has instituted various orders and diversity of offices, not all being apostles, or doctors, or pastors, so also has He appointed that there should be in civil society many orders, distinguished by their rank, privileges, and power; so that the State, like the Church, should be one body, comprising many members, some more noble than others, but all mutually necessary, and all concerned for the common good."

Next he warns all Governments that their peril is in their antagonism to the tradition of Christian civilisation, and that their only way of safety is in renewing their relations with it: "And therefore, venerable brethren, we, upon whom the government of the whole Church rests, as at the commencement of our pontificate we pointed out to the nations and princes exposed to the fury of the tempest the place of refuge where they might best seek for safety, now again, moved by the extremity of the impending peril, raise to them once more our apostolic voice, and entreat them, for the sake of their own and their people's welfare, to hearken to and obey the Church, which has done so much to maintain the prosperity of kingdoms, reminding them that the principles of religion and of government are so identified, that anything that injures religion must needs injuriously affect the loyalty of the subject and the majesty of government. And inasmuch as they must well know that there is in the Church of Christ a power to avert the plague of socialism, which is not to be found either in human laws, or in the rigour of magistrates, or in the force of arms, we exhort them to restore the Church to that position of liberty in which she may best exercise her saving influence for the benefit of all human society.

"But this audacity of perfidious men, which threatens greater ruin to civil society, and strikes the minds of all with anxious fear, derives its cause and origin from those poisonous doctrines which, scattered in former times like corrupt seed among the peoples, have borne such pestilential fruit in their season. For

you, venerable brethren, very well know that the object of the war which ever since the sixteenth century has been waged by innovators against the Catholic faith, and which has every day increased in intensity down to the present time, has been that, by the setting aside of all revelation, and the subversion of every kind of supernatural order, an entrance might be cleared for the discoveries, or rather the delirious imaginations, of mere reason. This kind of error, which wrongly usurps the name of reason, as it elicits and sharpens the desire of superiority, naturally implanted in man, and gives a loose rein to desires of every kind, has spontaneously penetrated to the wildest extent not only a multitude of minds, but civil society itself. Hence it has come to pass that, by a novel impiety, unheard of even among the heathen nations, States have been constituted without taking any account of God and of the order established by Him; it has been, moreover, declared that public authority derives neither its principle nor its power of command from God, but rather from the multitude of the people—which, thinking itself absolved from all Divine sanction, has determined to acknowledge only those laws which itself has framed according to its own good pleasure."

5. The social and political evils which are undermining the Christian society of the world culminate in one master evil, which again is prolific of all evils; an evil which reproduces and perpetuates the whole tradition of apostasy from the Christian name. The State is everywhere claiming the education and formation of men. Christianity is expelled from that formation.

Boys, youths, men, and nations will, if the Falk Laws and the Ferry Bills prevail, hereafter grow up in Germany and France, so far as the public laws can accomplish, without Christian faith or Christian morals. This State education is the formation of men "without Christ and without God in the world." And that is the truest description of paganism. Man without God ends in political Cæsarism and the deification of the civil power. On this, Leo XIII. says: "The supernatural verities of faith having been impugned and rejected as if they were inimical to reason, the Author and Redeemer Himself of the human race has been, little by little, forcibly banished from the universities, the lyceums, the gymnasiums, and from every public institution connected with the life of man. Finally, the rewards and punishments of the future and eternal life being relegated to oblivion, the ardent desire of happiness has been confined within the span of this present life. These doctrines having been disseminated far and wide, this so great license of thought and action being everywhere introduced, it is no wonder that men of the lowest class, weary of a poor home or workshop, should desire to invade the palaces and fortunes of the rich; it is no wonder that there now exists no tranquillity in public or private life, and that the human race has nearly reached its lowest depth."

In 1869—before the opening of the Vatican Council—the following words were written. They still describe the state of Europe at this day. There is not a Government in Europe except our own which has not a social

revolution at its back, urging it on toward manifest dangers, and, perhaps, towards its ruin:

"A moment's thought will be enough to explain why no civil Government was invited to attend the Council. What Government at this day professes to be Catholic? How should any Government which does not even claim to be Catholic be invited? What country in Europe at this day recognises the unity and authority of the Catholic Church as a part of its public laws? What country has not, by royal edicts, or legislative enactments, or revolutionary changes, abolished the legal status of the Catholic Church within its territory? On what plea, then, could they be invited? As Governments or nations they have by their own act withdrawn themselves from the unity of the Church. As moral or legal persons they are Catholic no longer. The faithful, indeed, among their subjects will be represented in the Council by their pastors; and their pastors are not only invited, but obliged to be present. If any separation has taken place, it is because the civil powers have separated themselves from the Church. They have created the fact; the Holy See has only recognised it. The gravity of the fact is not to be denied. It is strange that, with the immutability of the Church, and the 'progress,' as it is vaunted, of society before their eyes, men should charge upon the Church the responsibility of breaking its relations with society. The Church at one and the same time is accused of immobility and of change. It is not the Church which has departed from unity, science, liberty; but society which has departed from Christianity and from faith. It is said, 'If Chris-

tian unity be destroyed, if science have separated from faith, if liberty choose to reign without religion, a terrible share of the responsibility for these evils rests upon the men who have represented in the Christian world unity, faith, and religion.' Does this mean upon the Episcopate, Councils, and Pontiffs? Who, if not these, 'have represented in the Christian world unity, faith, and religion'? Have they, then, misrepresented these things to the world? If so, who shall represent them? and where, then, is the Divine office of the Church? The Pontiffs have been for generations lifting up their voices in vain to warn the Governments of Christendom of the peril of breaking the bonds which unite civil society to the faith and to the Church. They have maintained inflexibly, and at great suffering and danger, their own temporal dominion, not only for the spiritual independence of the Church, but for the consecration of civil society. But the Governments of the Christian world would not listen; and now a General Council meets, and the place where, as at the Lateran, at Florence, and at Trent, they would have sat, is empty. The tendency of civil society everywhere is to depart further and further from the Church. Progress in these days means to advance along the line of departure from the old Christian order of the world. The civil society of Christendom is the offspring of the Christian family, and the foundation of the Christian family is the Sacrament of Matrimony. From this spring domestic and public morals. Most Governments in Europe have ceased to recognise in marriage anything beyond the civil contract, and, by legalising divorce, have broken

up the perpetuity of even that natural contract. With this will surely perish the morality of society and of homes. A settlement in the foundations may be slow in sinking, but it brings down all at last. The civil and political society of Europe is steadily returning to the mere natural order. The next step in dechristianising the political life of nations is to establish national education without Christianity.[1] This is systematically aimed at wheresoever the revolution has its way. This may, before long, be attempted among ourselves. It is already in operation elsewhere. The Church must then form its own schools; and the civil power will first refuse its aid, and soon its permission, that parents should educate their offspring except in State universities and State schools. The period and the policy of Julian are returning. All this bodes ill for the Church, but worse for the State. The depression of the moral order of right and truth is the elevation of the material order of coercion and of force. The civil powers of the world do not choose this course: they only advance in it. There is behind them a power invisible, which urges them onward in their estrangements from the Church; and that unseen power is at work everywhere. It is one, universal, invisible, but not holy—the true, natural, and implacable enemy of the one, visible, universal Church. The anti-Christian societies are one in aim and operation, even if they be not one in conscious alliance. And the Governments of the world, some consciously, others unconsciously, disbelieving the

[1] Since this was written in 1868, the Empire fell. The Ferry Bill and the Act of 1870 have fulfilled the foresight.

existence of such societies, and therefore all the more surely under their influence, are being impelled toward a precipice over which monarchies and law and the civil order of the Christian society of men will go down together. It is the policy of the secret societies to engage Governments in quarrels with Rome. The breach is made, and the revolution enters. The Catholic society of Europe has been weakened, and wounded, it may be, unto death. The Catholic Church now stands alone, as in the beginning, in its Divine isolation: '*Et nunc reges intelligite; erudimini qui judicatis terram.*' There is an abyss before you, into which thrones and laws and rights and liberties may sink together. You have to choose between the revolution and the Church of God. As you choose, so will your lot be. The General Council gives to the world one more witness for the truths, laws, and sanctities, which include all that is pure, noble, just, venerable on earth. It will be an evil day for any State in Europe if it engage in conflict with the Church of God. No weapon formed against it ever yet has prospered." [2]

[2] *Œcumenical Council and the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.* London: Longmans, 1869.

XVII.

THE WORK AND WANTS OF THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

(*Dublin Review*, 1882.)

THE WORK AND WANTS OF THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

Sixteen years ago the *Dublin Review* began its second series. The first number contained an article on "The Work and Wants of the Church in England." Sixteen years are half a generation: and we may without impropriety, at the opening of a third series of the *Dublin Review*, once more survey our work and wants.

In doing so it will not be amiss to have before us the state of the Church in France at this time, as given in the work of Abbé Bougaud, Vicar-General of the diocese of Orleans. It describes to us the condition, momentary it is to be hoped, of one of the oldest and maturest Churches of Europe on a subject which is most vital to the Catholic Faith, its vocations to the priesthood; and it is, therefore, full of instruction to us, who are the youngest and least mature of the Churches of the West.

Abbé Bougaud's book treats chiefly, it may be said exclusively, of the state of the priesthood and of the pastoral office—that is, of the sacerdotal vocations, and of the cure of souls. On this one point the health and vigour of the Church depends. It is this one point also on which the restored Church in England has need to fix its chief efforts.

What Abbé Bougaud describes as the chief peril to the Church in France is the chief need of the Church in England: and yet, as we shall see, there is no peril in this need, but only a want that is being steadily and surely supplied.

But first we will give an account of Abbé Bougaud's book.

The *Grand Péril* opens with a remarkable passage of Comte de Maistre, who, at the beginning of this century, wrote as follows: "The priesthood ought to be at this moment the sovereign care of the social order which is endeavouring to renew itself. Let the higher classes offer their sons to the altar, as in times past. Let them render to the Church in dignity and wealth that which they have received themselves." "If I had before me the description of the ordinations to the priesthood, I should be able to foretell great events."

Abbé Bougaud then proceeds to offer proofs of the diminished number of vocations to the priesthood; and affirms that this evil is steadily increasing, and invading the most favoured dioceses. But he adds that this does not arise, in truth, from a diminution of vocations on God's part, which are always and everywhere abundant, but from the want of care, and culture, and piety on the part of parents and of others. One powerful cause which deters parents from encouraging and confirming the desire of their sons to become priests is the life of poverty, solitude, and suffering to which a priest is doomed. These discouragements are at present in great activity and force throughout France. The priesthood is the object of constant menace and slander.

Parents, therefore, so far from encouraging the vocation of their sons, often directly discourage and even destroy them. The consequences of this diminution in the sacerdotal vocations are manifold: all the chief offices of the Church are thereby weakened, such as the pastoral care of the country districts, and also of the towns, the work of missions, of study, and of teaching. Abbé Bougaud points out that from this cause the defence of religion, and the daily press, have passed into the hands of the laity. If he means to the exclusion of the clergy, without doubt it is an evil, not so much because the laity should become defenders of the Faith, as because the clergy ought to be so in an especial degree. He then goes on to show the bearing of this upon education: because it renders the finding and the forming of professors every day more difficult: also upon the propagation of the Faith, the ecclesiastical discipline, and the evangelisation of France. Of this he says: "Our population is not hostile to religion: they are ignorant of it: they live bowed down to the earth. You speak to them, but they do not understand. The weight of three or four generations who have lived without God weighs upon them."[1]

He then enters upon an examination of the causes of this evil, and says: "There would have been one remedy for this mournful state of things—namely, that the richer classes, the *noblesse*, the middle class, those commonly called the governing classes, should enter the priesthood, and bring into it their name, their fortune, their education, their knowledge of the world. For

[1] *Le Grand Péril*, p. 70.

sixty years the greatest minds and the greatest Bishops have been calling to them without making them hear."[2] The causes of this Abbé Bougaud finds in three things: first, "the deplorable habit of the aristocratic families to bring up their sons to do nothing;" secondly, in the religious indifference of the middle class; in a moral abasement; and in both classes, high and low, a systematic sterility. As to the first cause, he says: "They become neither soldiers, nor magistrates, nor priests. What, then, are they? They do not serve their country in the ministry of the sword, nor in the ministry of justice, nor in the ministry of the altar. For what, then, will they be fit? Let unexpected events come upon them, and take them unawares, they will be found wanting."[3] Of the indifference of the middle class he says: "How shall priests come forth from such homes where God is despised, or mocked, or absent? Alas! not even Christians come out of them. At fifteen years old the child drops the hand of his mother, even the most tenderly loved, and goes to swell the ranks of the indifferent."[4] "The question of the middle class is the great question of this age. If warned by the lightning which foreruns the storm, they return to God; then all the governing classes united together, the *noblesse* and the *bourgeoisie*, industry and commerce, the greater and the lesser proprietors, the people may be brought back who now are wandering, and, being astray, will, like children or madmen, break all things in their fury. But if, on the other hand, the *bourgeoisie*

[2] *Le Grand Péril*, p. 73.
[3] Ibid. p. 80.
[4] Ibid. p. 83

is obstinate, we must wrap our mantle about us and let the storm pass over. It will be terrible."[5] After a strong appeal to these classes, Abbé Bougaud points to the seventeenth century, and says: "At that time there was nothing more despised than the priesthood. People were ashamed to have a priest in their family. All at once there appeared three men of gentle birth, followed soon by a multitude of others: M. de Berulle, F. de Condren, M. Olier. They began by showing themselves every Sunday at the services of the parish church. They fulfilled the humblest duties; they carried the holy water or the torches; they brought the cruets to the altar; they were exact in wearing the ecclesiastical habit. Soon arose the ordination retreats; when Bossuet listened to S. Vincent of Paul, Cardinal de Berulle, and, still more, F. de Condren, raised the idea of the priesthood to its greatest height. M. Olier founded seminaries, and gave the definitive form to the priesthood of France. The movement spread to the provinces; everywhere men of gentle birth arose, sons of functionaries and councillors of Parliament, who desired as an honour the character of priesthood, so despised five-and-twenty years before, of which the greatest men did not then count themselves worthy." "The other day," he says, "I saw a young lady of great name, and of a brilliant fortune. She said, 'I pass in my family for slightly mad, for I have only one son, and I say openly that I should be proud if God could have him for His service. People say to me, "What are you thinking of? You have him only, and

[5] *Le Grand Péril*, p. 83.

he is necessary for the keeping up of the name;" and I say, 'What more beautiful lot than for a family to extinguish itself at the foot of the altar! We shall come to an end sooner or later. In three hundred years who will remember the Counts of ——? They will have disappeared: and who knows? perhaps less to their honour.'"[6]

Abbé Bougaud then turns to the remedies for this evil. He classes them as follows: First, as it is God Who calls men to the priesthood, we must pray to Him for vocations; next, we must carefully and religiously search out the germs of them in youths and boys. This duty chiefly and primarily rests on fathers and mothers, and after parents it rests upon priests, and after priests it rests on every Christian who loves God and the Church.

He then passes to the means whereby such vocations may be unfolded and sustained. The first is the *école presbytérale*, the priest's house. He mentions an aged Canon of Orleans, who said, "I am eighty-three, and shall soon die. I have not done all the good I would. But one thing consoles me: I leave behind thirty-three priests, whom I have formed, and they will do better than I have done." Another priest, on the jubilee of his priesthood, was surrounded by more than twenty priests who had in like manner been formed by him. He was a disciple of the aged Canon of Orleans, who, on the day of his ordination, said to him, "Always have pupils in your presbytery. You will be their angel, and they will be yours."

[6] *Le Grand Péril*, pp. 91, 92.

The next chief means of developing vocations is the formation of the lesser seminaries. It is found that wheresoever these exist, vocations multiply; where they are absent, vocations are wanting. The first act of the Bishops who, after the great Revolution had passed away, returned to their dioceses was to establish seminaries. So great was their poverty that their only schools were held in houses, damp, dark, and overcrowded. The boys used to bring their dinners. The professors received no stipend. One of them after three years of work received a copy of Fleury's *Ecclesiastical History*. But this was the beginning of the movement which has spread so widely throughout France.

Vocations began to multiply; but in the year 1830 the lesser seminaries, which till then received clerics only according to the decree of the Council of Trent, were unable to resist the urgent prayers of Catholic parents to receive their sons as the only way to save them from the State lycées and colleges, which were corrupt both in faith and morals. But this change was fatal to many vocations. The students came out of them Christians indeed — avocats, physicians, notaries—but not priests. In one lesser seminary, which used to have from eighty to a hundred clerics, the number fell to twenty-two; in another, out of forty-four only four persevered. In one ecclesiastical college of four hundred, in ten years there was one solitary vocation.

Abbé Bougaud then passes to the greater seminaries, and shows how the Government has suppressed even the burses in seminaries held by congregations.

Finally, he urges the foundation of burses and half-burses by the generosity of the faithful, and proposes the formation of an *œuvre des vocations ecclésiastiques* as a third obligation following the *œuvre* of the Denier de S. Pierre, and that of the Propagation de la Foi.

These are briefly the contents of Abbé Bougaud's able and timely book.

And such is the estimate of Abbé Bougaud as to the present state of the Church in France. Surrounded as he is with the political and social evils of his country, it is no wonder if he be depressed even out of measure. But looking upon the great Church in France, as we can, from a distance, we are perhaps able to measure more justly the magnitude of its position and its power. When we compare its present state with its condition under Louis XIV. or Louis XV., or in 1789 or, again, in 1815 or in 1830, we have no hesitation in declaring our belief that it is more independent, more united, more pure, and therefore more powerful, than at any of these five periods. No one who has read M. Gérin's account of the Church in France in 1662, in his *Recherches Historiques sur l'Assemblée du Clergé de France de* 1682,"[7] or its condition in 1789 as given by M. Taine, in his *Origines de la France Contemporaine*,[8] will doubt this for a moment. Take as proof the close union of the great Episcopate of France with the Holy See at this day; its compact unity in itself; the quality of its forty thousand priests; its numerous and multiplying

[7] Paris: Lecoffre, 1869, *passim*. [8] Tom. i. liv. iii. c. 1, 2

seminaries, greater and lesser; its lay colleges of every class; its multitudes of religious bodies of men and women, more numerous than even in the height of its prosperity before the first great Revolution; the spreading return of faith, and of practical religion among men of every class—all these are evidence of a health and vigour not to be found in the former periods of the French Church. The warfare of the Revolution, with its indifference and its unbelief against faith and the Church, is certainly more keen than it was. But the French Church has weathered worse storms than this, and has come out purified and strengthened by the conflict. Moreover, the chief subject of Abbé Bougaud's fears would not seem to be so menacing as he believes. That in many dioceses there is a lack of priests is not to be denied; but that the number of vocations to the priesthood in France is on the decline has been denied by responsible witnesses in the dioceses of Périgeux, Cambrai, and Meaux, which were coloured in Abbé Bougaud's map as examples of this decline. The impression made by Abbé Bougaud's statements would rather be that, at this moment, exceptional causes are producing an exceptional state, that is, a momentary retardation in the steady increase of vocations, and in the number of the clergy, which, in the greater part of France, has been advancing from 1815 to 1870. This appears from the frequent use of the words "of late" and for some years," and the like.[9] It is nothing less than a miracle of grace that the priesthood of the Church in France should have so

[9] *Le Grand Péril.*

steadily risen again through the poisoned atmosphere of an infidel empire, a Voltairian monarchy, and a public opinion perverted by the daily mockery and cynicism of the French journalists. If there be a momentary check, there is all reason to believe that the fervour of France will soon turn again to the priesthood, and make up for a few years of slackened zeal, "redeeming the time because the days are evil." France has been passing through the fires of an inevitable and salutary purgation. A century of revolutions has burnt out to the roots the motives which once prompted men to seek the ecclesiastical state. The motives of this world exist no longer; the *Budget du Clergé* and the starvation of the priests in the provinces have certainly no temptation for worldly, ambitious, or covetous men. The pomp and state of the old hierarchy has been withered and seared by the mockery and contempt of a hundred years of infidelity. For a moment the multiplication of the labourers seems to be slackened. But the dignity and perfection of the priesthood, and the blessedness of a pastor's life, restored with apostolic poverty and purity, are too deeply impressed upon France for this momentary stay in the tide to last long. Priests and soldiers made Catholic France; and we might as soon believe that her armies would decline, as that her priesthood would diminish.

We will now turn homeward to ourselves.

Sixteen years ago we noted five chief wants of the Church in England, as follows:

1. Diocesan seminaries according to the mind of the Council of Trent.

2. Middle-class schools.
3. Higher studies for our laity.
4. Political education, practical efficiency and participation in the public affairs of the country for our laymen.
5. A college for foreign missions.

In many of these heads we may now give no unfavourable an account.

1. The decree of the Council of Trent prescribes that there shall be attached to every cathedral church a seminary, into which those who are destined for the priesthood shall be admitted from the age of twelve years. All that is required is that they shall be able competently to read and write, and that their character and disposition give hope of their perseverance in the ecclesiastical state. The Council prefers (*præcipue vult*) the sons of poorer parents, but it does not exclude the sons of the rich if they will maintain themselves. It then enjoins, "In order that they may be the better trained in the same ecclesiastical discipline, they shall at once and always wear the tonsure and the habit of the clergy." Such were the lesser seminaries in France before 1830, when, with the result we have already seen, they became mixed colleges. Now, until the last ten years no such Tridentine seminary existed in England. The admission of lay students into our noble and excellent colleges of Ushaw, Oscott, and S. Edmund's placed them outside of the Tridentine definition. Nevertheless, the Church boys and Church students, after due probation, wore the cassock, and after years of probation were tonsured.

In France it would appear that in such mixed colleges vocations to the priesthood were notably extinguished by the spirit of the lay boys. In England it has not been so in the same degree. Many have been lost, but some have been gained. Whether the loss or the gain predominate it is not easy to say. But we must remember that the youths of France are the sons of fathers reared in traditions of unbelief, or, at least, of indifference. The youths of England are the sons of fathers who were under the penal laws. If our mixed colleges have not extinguished more vocations, it may perhaps be ascribed to a tradition of Catholic fervour kindled in times of persecution. Its continuance will depend on our fidelity; and, if lost, we may find ourselves as our brethren in France.

At this moment we possess no lesser seminary, according to the Council of Trent; but in the last ten years a notable progress in greater seminaries has been made. In 1868 the students in theology for the diocese of Westminster, with their professors, were removed from S. Edmund's College to the old Benedictine convent at Hammersmith; and a seminary, strictly so called, was founded. Soon after, the clergy and laity of the diocese of Birmingham made an offering to their Bishop on the half-jubilee of his episcopate, by which was founded the seminary at Olton. The students in philosophy and theology were removed to it from S. Mary's, Oscott. The Bishop of Salford next founded a seminary attached to his own house and cathedral, in which ecclesiastical students may be trained, and priests before entering on the cure of souls

may pass an additional year of training. The Bishop of Clifton has founded a seminary at Prior Park; the Bishop of Beverley at Leeds; the Bishops of Shrewsbury, Southwark, and Liverpool are already possessed of all, or nearly all, the means required, and are preparing to build. In ten years, therefore, five dioceses have founded seminaries, either wholly or almost wholly, in conformity with the Council of Trent. Three other dioceses are about to do the same.

A diocesan seminary is not only the necessary means to sustain and confirm the vocations of youth: it generates and elicits them. When the parents and their sons see before their eyes the diocesan seminary, and when they see the seminarists Sunday by Sunday in the sanctuary of the cathedral, or in other churches of the diocese, it is certain that many hearts are drawn to desire the same grace. Already there is reason to believe that vocations have thus been multiplied, and among us vocations are steadily increasing. We have, indeed, no lack of vocations, but only of means to support them. In most dioceses in England the diocesan clergy have been doubled since the restoration of the hierarchy; and the number of the ecclesiastical students has also been either doubled or very greatly increased.

The disposition to enter the priesthood on the part of educated men is becoming more marked year after year. Our higher families, and those of the middle class, have most of them sons or daughters or kindred among the priests and nuns of England. Our middle classes count it a happiness and an honour to have a son

at the altar. And the aspiration of many a poor father and mother is being daily fulfilled in the ordination of some of our most refined and holy priests. This signal grace may indeed decline among us as elsewhere; but we have safeguards against so great a decline. In England and Ireland the Christian equality of classes checks the invasion of the spirit of caste. The son of the *vigneron* and the son of the *seigneur* are among our people neither *abbé* nor *abbate*, but plain father. We have no ecclesiastics up in balloons, but living and labouring in the midst of men on our common earth, and in daily contact and sympathy with the people. In no country is truer respect paid to the upper classes than in England. If they fail to receive it, they may thank themselves for the loss of it. But the priesthood is honoured by the Christian and Catholic instincts of this country with a manly and dignified respect. The families who would not thankfully see a son at the altar are few.

2. Another manifest want of the Catholic Church in England was, and is, a supply of schools for the middle class. The need of providing schools for the poor was, at the restoration of the Hierarchy, so urgent and so overwhelming, that though in the First Provincial Council of Westminster the wants of the middle class were expressly recognised, it was impossible to provide for them until the needs of the poor had first been met. To this work the Bishops and clergy gave themselves with a great devotion, the result of which is that at this moment we possess some fourteen hundred schools, with about one hundred and forty thousand

children in attendance. When it is remembered that in 1847, at the foundation of the Poor School Committee, all the Catholic poor-schools known to exist in England were about three hundred, it can be no matter of wonder that the formation of middle schools had not as yet been systematically undertaken. It is rather a cause of wonder and of thankfulness that so large and complete a system of poor-schools should have been created in the last thirty years. Moreover, at that date the middle class, which is now multiplying daily, was only coming into existence. Between the rich and the poor there were individuals, but not classes. In the Catholic Church in England there were no gradations such as exist in the social order of the English people. It was with us as it was in Ireland, where, between the cities and the level of the people in villages, there were few lesser towns which in England keep up a continuity in the population, the education, and the wealth of the country. In all our large dioceses this middle class has been gradually forming, and though still not numerous, it is large enough to require a higher scale of education in separate schools. These now exist in almost every diocese, and in some they are already numerous. As the demand for higher education increases, our colleges rise to meet it. New schools on a lower level then spring up. Two schools are thus formed out of the upper and lower classes of one and the same college. What began as a commercial college rises into a classical college, and a middle school takes up its lower class. In one diocese alone there are thirteen middle schools, containing four or five

hundred boys. They are examined every year by the diocesan inspector, and prizes are given on a public day to those who have gained them by competition.

3. Sixteen years ago the need of higher culture for our Catholic youth from eighteen to twenty-two years of age had forced itself upon our attention. It was alleged that our existing colleges did not provide it; and, by reason of the mixture of boys and youths, could not be made to provide it for young men. A desire then sprang up in some quarters to send their sons to the national Universities. The question was long and elaborately debated. In the *Dublin Review* of July 1863 the arguments on either side of this question are briefly given. But the question was referred to the Holy See, from which the following decisions emanated:

I. On December 13th, 1864, the assembled Bishops of England declared (1) "that the establishment of Catholic colleges at the" Protestant "Universities could in no way be approved;" and (2) "that parents were by all means to be dissuaded from sending their sons to the Universities." On February 3rd, 1865, the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda wrote word that "the Sacred Congregation had, after mature examination, confirmed the judgment of the Bishops, as being in entire conformity with the principles which the said Congregation had always laid down." And on March 24th, the Bishops issued a circular letter, informing the clergy of these decisions.

II. On March 12th, 1867, the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda wrote to the Archbishop, stating "that the Sacred Congregation, by its resolution of December 1866, with respect to the establishment of a community [the Oratory] at Oxford, had wished only to provide for the spiritual wants of the Catholics of that city; and not in any way to lessen the force of the declarations made by the Holy See [10] against the establishment

[10] It will be observed that the Cardinal Prefect ascribes these declarations to "the Holy See" itself.

of a college at Oxford, and against the dispositions of those who should desire a pretext for sending Catholic youths to study at that University." The Cardinal Prefect further directed the Bishops to confer again on the subject, and to communicate with the Propaganda upon the measures to be taken for preventing Catholics from studying at Oxford.

III. On May 1st, 1867, the Bishops addressed a letter to the Propaganda, in which they confirmed their declaration of December 13th, 1864; and stated that they would wish to make known to the faithful, both by pastoral letters and indirectly through the clergy, the grave danger incurred by those who should enter the Universities in spite of the admonitionof their pastors. On August 6th the Cardinal Prefect wrote back, desiring the Bishops to address such pastoral letters as had been suggested. The Cardinal Prefect's letter included these words: "You will clearly explain in your pastoral letter the doctrine of the Church on avoiding the proximate occasions of mortal sin; to which occasions no one without grievous sin can expose himself, unless under the pressure of grave and adequate necessity, and unless such precautions be taken as shall remove all proximate danger. And in the present case, where, as his Holiness has declared,[11] there is an intrinsic and very serious danger to purity of morals as well as to faith (which is altogether necessaryfor salvation), it is next to impossible to discover circumstances in which Catholics could without sin attend non-Catholic Universities."[12]

IV. On September 19th, 1872, the Cardinal Prefect wrote to the English Bishops as follows, referring to the previous declaration of 1865: "The declaration then given was founded on the grave dangers which the said Universities presented. . . . . Not only does the Holy See perceive no reason why it should recede from the aforementioned decision of 1865; but in proportion as the reasons which called forth that decision have increased in gravity, so much the more necessary does it appear that the decision should be maintained."

V. On August 12th, 1873, the English Bishops, assembled in Provincial Synod, addressed a pastoral letter to the faithful, in which, not only they recite the above words of the Cardinal Prefect, but add that no Catholic parent can send his son to a Protestant University "without incurring grave sin."

[11] Here, again, it will be observed that the declaration is ascribed to "his Holiness."

[12] We take the preceding documents from the Acts of the Westminster Diocesan Synod of 1872.

The Holy See gave two injunctions to the Bishops of England: the one, that Catholic parents are to be restrained from sending their sons to the national Universities; the other, that they should take steps so to raise the higher studies in our existing colleges as to take away from Catholic parents all pretext on that head for sending their sons to Oxford or Cambridge. It was also part of the injunction that a Board of Examiners should be formed to test and ascertain the state and efficiency of the studies in our existing colleges.

In the Fourth Provincial Council of Westminster a decree was made embodying these injunctions, with an express declaration that though the formation of a Catholic university properly so called is at this time beyond our power, yet that we would leave nothing untried to prepare the way for founding such an university hereafter.

In pursuance of this decree the Bishops proceeded to consult the representatives of every Catholic collgee in England. The proposal to unite in a general system of examination was then made, but no practical result followed. For what reason the proposal failed of its effect it may not be easy to define; nor is it necessary to enter upon it now. Some thought that the formation of a body of examiners ought to precede the foundation of any college; others, that the foundation of a college was the only way to make intelligible the objects the Bishops had in view. The latter opinion prevailed. The Bishops decided to found a college at Kensington. They did so in the desire to provide a full and ample course

of higher studies for such young Catholic men as, after leaving our existing colleges, still desired, either for its own sake or for professional careers, a more advanced knowledge of literature or of science. The staff of professors was justly acknowledged, both by those who wished well to the college and by those who did not, to be highly qualified. The non-Catholic papers and critics bore the same testimony. During the last five years ninety-seven young men, all of whom, excepting about fourteen, were English or Irish, entered the college. Some had made good use of their past time, and were able to derive benefit from the courses of the professors. The greater part showed no high aspirations for study. Some very little. The highest number of the students at any one time was forty-four. From that point the number declined to twelve. Two things became evident: the one, that very few came to Kensington for the sake of higher studies, which was the end and purpose for which the college had been founded; the other, that for the most part the students came for the sake of passing some examination, such as for the army, or for medicine, or for matriculation at the London University. But this last function belongs properly to our existing colleges, and should be accomplished before students reach their eighteenth year. To matriculate at the London University is obviously no part, or only the lowest part, of the work for which a college of higher studies was intended. As to both medicine and the army, recent arrangements of the military and medical authorities require that young men destined for those professions shall enter the

respective colleges and begin their technical and professional studies by seventeen or eighteen years of age. This renders the Kensington college useless to them, for it cannot receive them before their eighteenth year, and they cannot continue in it after that age. The experience, therefore, of the last five years has led to the belief that for the present it will be expedient for our existing colleges to raise their studies as high as they are able, and to retain their students as long as they can. The only test we have at this time of the efficiency, absolute or relative, of our existing colleges is in the results obtained by S. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, and the College of Stonyhurst. Both have attained a highly creditable success, which shows that many of our Catholic youth are already measuring strength with the youth of England at no disadvantage. The results are, during the last sixteen years, as follows:

S. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw.

Number of Degrees, &c., obtained by Ushaw Students in the London University in the last fifteen years.

Number of matriculated students, 171. Of these, 33 obtained honours and 2 obtained prizes.

51 have passed the first B.A. examination. Of these, 8 obtained honours and 3 obtained exhibitions.

33 have passed the second B.A. examination. Of these, 6 obtained honours, and 1 obtained a scholarship and 1 a prize.

4 have passed the M.A. examination and 1 obtained a gold medal in classics.

Stonyhurst College.

From 1863—1878, *inclusive.*

Matriculated	. .	139
1st. B.A.	Passed .	41
B.A.	„ . .	26
M.A.	„ . .	4

1st. B.A. Honours :			
Latin	21	exhibition	2
French	5	prize 10*l.*	1
Mathematics	1		
B.A. Honours :			
Classics	13	scholarship	3
Logic, &c.	2		
M.A. Honours :			
Logic		gold medal	1
Classics		medal marks	1
		first on list	1
Matriculation		prize 10*l.*	1
		Prize marks	11

Five B.A. Honour men are under examination at this date.

The day will come when it will be seen that young men can hardly be formed among boys, and that boys are better trained by themselves. The disadvantage is mutual—both suffer from being mixed together, and the time of separation will come. Perhaps it is not come as yet, and we must wait for it, for there is a law of growth in all things. We can see farther than we can reach, but we can only do what is within the length of our arm. That a college of higher studies for Catholic young men will one day be demanded is certain; so also that their isolation from boys, and their treatment by other modes of discipline are of absolute necessity, cannot be doubted. We may confidently hope that the timid and narrow counsels, howsoever sincere and well intended, of those who desired to see our Catholic youth at Oxford and Cambridge, will be heard no more. Such a policy would be an inversion of the Divine order of the Church. It would be an engrafting of the tradition of Catholic culture upon "the stock that is wild by nature." The Divine method

is precisely the reverse. If the Catholic Church in England be at this moment impoverished in its intellectual culture by the spoliation of its ancient schools, if it still bear upon it the most galling and humbling relics of penal laws, an impoverishment in its classical and scientific education, that is no reason for it to sacrifice the greater for the less, the sacred for the secular, the supernatural for the natural, and to abdicate its Divine commission to possess itself of all sciences of God and man and the world, and to form and develop the whole nature of its disciples. The counsel to do of our own free-will in England that which Catholics have been forced to do under Imperial laws in France and Germany—that is, to plunge our youth into the atmosphere and stream of mixed universities—is an advice which, in the next generation, Catholics will hardly believe was ever seriously given to the faithful at this day. Set aside for a moment the injunctions of the Holy See, the unlawfulness of exposing our youth to the proximate occasion of danger to faith and morals; there is yet another reason why the Catholic Church in England is bound to bear with patience for a time any transient disadvantage, rather than entangle itself in an un-Catholic and unstable intellectual tradition. It would render impossible the completion of its own Catholic culture. From the day in which it began to rest itself upon any basis out of its own intellectual unity it would cease to cultivate itself. Its own internal self-completion would be arrested. It would remain stunted. It would possess no more than a system of poor-schools and middle-class

schools, with colleges answering to Eton and Harrow and Winchester at the best. While France, and Belgium, and Germany, and Ireland are forming Catholic universities, the Church in England, which has been revived by a miracle of grace, and draws to itself the eyes and the goodwill of the Catholic world, would remain by its own free choice a mendicant on the un-Catholic intellect of England for letters and for science. From such a humiliation may God preserve us!

Let us imagine for a moment that such a half-hearted counsel had prevailed over our forefathers, to whom we owe Ushaw, and Stonyhurst, and Oscott, and Downside, and S. Edmund's; the Catholics of this day would be the offspring of the boarding-schools and public schools, into which no Catholic parents with the fear of God before their eyes could trust a son. What would be the Catholic laity of England at this day nurtured in such a culture? What would the Catholic Bishops and priests and faithful of Ireland judge of us? Would they own us as their brethren? Their instincts are those of the unbroken tradition of a Catholic people; ours would be neither Catholic nor anti-Catholic, "neither cold nor hot." We are bound to guard those who come after, as our forefathers guarded us. By their fidelity in the midst of depression sevenfold greater, and of temptation a hundredfold stronger, we are, under God, what we are. Our posterity, trained in un-Catholic universities, would be no longer even what we are. Theirs would be the privation, but the betrayal would be ours. The Bishops of England have

given a public pledge in the foundation of the college at Kensington that they will leave nothing undone to avert so great a disaster, and they will await the time when what they offered five years ago, perhaps before it was required, shall be demanded by the fathers of our Catholic youth.

4. Another obvious want of the Catholic Church among us, which was noted sixteen years ago, was of laymen trained and able to compete and to lead in the public careers of English life. We will not say in the public life of the Empire, for in our colonies Catholics hold the highest offices, and have even formed Cabinets, and governed as prime ministers. But in England, partly from the solid and dominant strength of the non-Catholic traditions and the non-Catholic life of England, Catholics are practically excluded from the Cabinet and from Parliament. Sixteen years ago one Catholic sat for a family borough. Now not one Catholic sits for an English constituency, and yet the Catholic population is at least one million in twenty-three. The proportion of members, therefore, ought to be as one in twenty-three, or about twenty upon the representatives for Great Britain. In the sixteen years that are passed we have therefore made no sensible progress in the public life of our country. Of our progress in the civil life of England it is not easy to form a judgment. There may be more of our young men entering upon professional careers, but as yet no high office of trust is held by a Catholic. The traditions of prejudice and social exclusiveness will no doubt go far to account for this ; but if our rising men have

equal force of character and equal cultivation with their non-Catholic countrymen they will break through these barriers. That they have not yet done so seems to point to defects either in force or in cultivation, or perhaps in both.

A list has lately been published of those who in England during the last thirty years have submitted to the Divine authority of the Catholic Church. The intention of the compiler was no doubt good, but the undertaking was hardly to be commended. It could not fail to reopen many domestic wounds, and to retard rather than to promote an inclination to the Catholic faith. It is open also to the just censure of those who think to honour Christianity by saying that great intellects like Newton and Leibnitz were Christians. The Catholic Church receives no illustration from those who have the happiness to submit themselves to its Divine authority. Lastly, such a list, long as it may be, represents the number of those who have been gathered into the Catholic Church about as much as the *Court Guide* represents the people of England. It does not even represent the number of those who have been received from the "upper ten thousand," for many a name represents not only a family but a much larger aggregate of those who, through them, have one by one come to the knowledge of the truth. No such list can ever be an adequate expression of the progress of the Church in England, which is not to be measured by numbers, but by the progress of truth, and by the dissipation of false doctrines and traditional hostility to the faith.

5. Lastly, we may record one great work which has been done since our last review of the work and wants of the Church in England. It had then no college for foreign missions, or, more properly, for missions to the heathen world. It has now a noble college, well founded, and in full activity.

When the late Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster was making his retreat in 1839, before his consecration as Vicar-Apostolic, he wrote down a number of works which he hoped to see accomplished. Among these, one was the foundation of a college for missions to the heathen. The desire to begin such a work sprung up, in 1863, in the mind of Father Vaughan, Oblate of S. Charles. His purpose received the sanction and encouragement of the late Cardinal, and of the Bishops of England and of Scotland. He then obtained the blessing of Pius IX. and a Brief of commendation conveying the Apostolic benediction to all at home or abroad who should contribute to the work. With this sanction Father Vaughan traversed North and South America, and returned in the autumn of 1865 with means sufficient, together with the contributions at home, to begin the work. In March 1866 he began in a country house at Mill Hill with one student. In the week after Easter 1868 a public meeting was held in St. James's Hall by the Archbishop and Bishops of England, of whom eight were present, with a large attendance of the Catholic laity of all classes, to give public acceptance and confirmation to the College for Foreign Missions. In June 1869 the foundation-stone of the new college building was laid by the Archbishop, assisted

by the Bishops of Beverley and Troy. In March 1870 the first stone of the church attached to the college, and dedicated to S. Joseph, Patron of the Universal Church, was laid.

In March 1871 the dwelling part of the college was opened free of debt, and Father Vaughan, with twelve students, entered upon it. A number of French students from the African College at Lyons, driven out by the Franco-German War, were received in hospitality to complete their studies.

On the 10th of October, in 1871, the Negro Mission in the Southern States of America was confided to the missionaries of S. Joseph's College, and on November 17th Father Vaughan took over with him the first four priests ordained for this mission in Baltimore.

On the Feast of S. Simon and S. Jude, in 1872, Father Vaughan was consecrated to the see of Salford and on December 3rd, 1873, said the first Mass in the new church of S. Joseph, which was still unfinished. In the following year the church was consecrated. In November 1875 five missionaries were sent to India.

The community at this time consists of four directors, thirty-eight students, and five lay brothers.

From the outset of the college until now, thirty-one missionaries have been sent out, of whom four are dead.

The stations of the missionaries among the negro population of America were first in Baltimore, where four are attached to a church for the negroes only; two attend the negroes in Prince George's County; one is stationed at a negro chapel-school at Louisville; and two at Charleston.

The stations in India are as follows: Of the eleven missionaries now in India, two are in charge of S. Mary's Seminary, which the Vicar-Apostolic of Madras has erected for the purpose of giving a classical education to those who are destined for the learned professions. Nine are on the missions—viz. seven in the Guntoor district, and two in the Nellore district.

The Vicar-Apostolic of Madras wrote on the 13th of April 1878:

"In all parts of the vicariate there is a consoling movement in the Hindoos towards Christianity. From the 1st of January 1877 to the 6th of March 1878, 497 Hindoo families, numbering 1858 souls, were received into the Church by baptism. And on Ash-Wednesday last there were under instruction for baptism 963 families, numbering 3795 souls. Many of these latter have already been baptised; and since Ash-Wednesday the priests have received petitions from many other villages who desire to be admitted into the Church.

There is a great work to be done in Madras at present. But it is a work of great privation and great labour. The poor villagers who seek instruction are of the very poorest class, and reside in places distant from the residence of the priests, and so far apart from each other that the priest's work among them is extremely difficult and laborious.

I shall be ever grateful if, in consultation with Dr. Vaughan, you can arrange to send me two new missionaries.

May 22nd, 1878.—The work thrown upon the priests is very heavy indeed. I am not without anxiety for the lives of the priests, who are overtasking their strength to meet the crisis. . . . . All the priests [from Mill Hill] are, thank God, working zealously They are all pious good priests."

It was at first thought by some, of whose devotion there could be no doubt, that the founding of a missionary college while England is hardly emerged from a missionary state was premature; that it would divert men and means needed at home before we can afford to

send them abroad. But this objection did not last long. It was soon acknowledged that the Catholics of England are in an especial way bound to give to others what has been so mercifully given back to them: that we are not only bound by the law of faith, "Give, and it shall be given to you;" but by the law of gratitude, "Give, because it has been given to you." And, further, a little thought is enough to show that a love for the souls of the heathen world can hardly be awakened without awakening sevenfold a love for the souls at home: that this sixth sense, as it has been well named, will be more surely called into activity and intensity by rousing it in its amplest extent and in its highest motives. Moreover, the example of apostolic life and complete self-oblation in those who go forth from the midst of us must react upon those who have the cure of souls at home. And if the day should come when any one, who was a little while ago one of ourselves, should lay down his life for the salvation of the heathen, we should ourselves be elevated by his nearness to us all, and his martyrdom would be a part of our own inheritance. Such is the happiness of many a family in France; and the Church in France is strengthened and sustained by the prayers and crowned with the aureolas of its many martyrs in these days of its conflict at home.

Of the five wants we noted sixteen years ago, three may be said to be supplied, or in a fair way to be supplied. For our seminaries, middle schools, and our missionary college we need multiplication, and a perpetual rise in the quality of their work. Time

alone can give maturity, and all good fruits ripen slowly.

Two wants still remain. But they are so large that a longer period of careful cultivation and slow growth are needed. There will be hereafter adequate higher studies for our youth, and a participation in the public and civil offices of the State. But such wants can only be supplied by laws which govern the moral and spiritual, as well as the intellectual, development of a people.

While these special works have been accomplishing, the whole internal organisation of the Church has been advancing. The following table will show what has been the multiplication of all its agencies since the year 1850. The increase in the number of priests and churches has been brought down to 1878. Under the other heads we have data only down to 1875. It will be seen that all that the last three centuries had bequeathed to this generation, of clergy, churches, colleges, and schools, has in the last twenty-eight years been doubled; that the convents are nearly fivefold; and the poor-schools and children attending them have been multiplied also fivefold, or in a proportion which cannot be ascertained.

To what is this manifold development of the Church during the last eight-and-twenty years to be ascribed? Not to any notable increase in the Catholic population of England and Wales; for, so far as we can ascertain, it remains as it was, and in some places has even diminished, though in others it may have increased; nor to any extraordinary events or agencies

Table of Priests, Churches, Convents, Monasteries, Colleges, Schools, and of Children frequenting them, showing the Progress of the Catholic Religion in England from the Restoration of the Hierarchy in 1850 *to* 1878.

Dioceses.	Priests.		Churches and Public Chapels.		Religious Houses. Men.		Religious Houses. Women.		Colleges.		Poor Schools.		Children attending.	
	1851.	1878.	1851.	1878.	1851.	1875.	1851.	1875.	1851.	1875.		1875.		1875.
Westminster . .	113	311	46	103	2	14	9	55	1	5	38	182	8333	18,130
Beverley . .	69	152	61	110	1	5	2	19	1	1	33	112		10,877
Birmingham . .	121	188	84	106	5	4	14	27	1	2	35	114		12,631
Clifton . . .	49	75	23	38	2	2	5	16	2	2	18	40	800	2,400
Hexham & Newcastle	70	132	51	101	...	1	2	15	1	1	70	116	7000	12,353
Liverpool . .	113	261	79	126	1	4	2	34	1	1		336		27,437
Newport . .	22	55	21	56	...	6	...	7	...	...		54		5,000
Northampton . .	27	39	26	45	...	...	1	7	...	...	13	24	400	993
Nottingham . .	53	99	42	74	3	5	4	6	2	2		33		3,000
Plymouth . .	25	44	28	40	...	...	5	11	...	...	14	28	690	1,805
Salford. . .	61	190	35	93	...	2	1	17	1	1	42	161		24,790
Shrewsbury . .	33	110	30	69	1	4	1	8	...	1		60		5,152
Southwark . .	67	227	57	134	1	12	9	35	...	4	79	137	3235	9,255
Total . .	823	1883*	583	1095†	16	59	55	257	10	20		1397		133,823

* Now 2314. † Now 1304.

for none such can be found. There is but one evident and assignable cause, and that is the lifting of the Catholic religion in England from the abnormal and mutilated state in which it had so long lain depressed and enfeebled, and its restoration to the normal and perfect order of its Divine organisation. S. Paul, in writing to the Ephesians, says that the end for which the Divine orders of pastors and of priests were ordained is "for the edifying of the Body of Christ," which he there describes as a living frame, developing and perfecting itself by the interaction of its own vital powers and organs. And these are the orders and ministries of its pastors. But this pastoral office is the apostolate which the Divine Head of the Church gave first to Peter alone—that is, the plenitude of faith and of jurisdiction; and afterwards *per modum unius* to Peter with the Apostles. They shared the same endowments, save only that the Primacy was in Peter alone. They had by participation what he had in fulness and alone. This Divine organisation of the Church cannot be mutilated without injury to the vital action of the body, as any lesion of the human structure impedes or even threatens life. Peter and the apostolate live on for ever in the successor of Peter, and in the successors of the Apostles. The Primacy and the apostolate are both Divine and indefectible. Peter lives on in his successor, who, in strictness, is the sole successor of an Apostle, for Peter was the only Apostle who had the Primacy or plenitude of faith and of jurisdiction, and his successor has the same. But the Episcopate is the apostolate spreading throughout

the world, and perpetual in all time. Every Bishop is pastor and judge of doctrine, a *Christo constitutus*. He has a Divine jurisdiction, ordinary and immediate, but limited to the flock assigned to him; and he has also, not an universal jurisdiction. but a participation in the endowments of the universal Episcopate when united to its Head in Council. The Bishops as a body are successors of the Apostles as a body; not each to each, but as a whole to a whole, of which the successor of Peter is Head and Chief. S. Cyprian says: "The Episcopate is one of which each holds a share in full."[13] In this sense the Council of Trent says that "Bishops, who succeed in the place of the Apostles, form a chief part of the hierarchical order, and are set, as the Apostle says, by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God."[14] And in like manner the Council of the Vatican, in defining the supreme jurisdiction of the successor of Peter, goes on carefully to declare the Divine origin and pastoral authority of the Episcopate. Its words are grave, and full of meaning. After defining the supremacy of Peter and his successors, the Council proceeds to say, "So far is this power of the Supreme Pontiff from obstructing the ordinary and immediate episcopal jurisdiction, whereby Bishops, who are set by the Holy Ghost and succeed in the place of the Apostles, as true pastors feed and rule the several flocks assigned to each, that this same jurisdiction of theirs is assisted, strengthened, and vindicated by the Supreme and Universal Pastor, according to the words of S. Gregory the Great, 'My honour is the

[13] *De Unit. Eccl.*, p. 180. [14] Sess., xxxiii cap. 11.

honour of the Universal Church. Then I am honoured indeed, when the honour due to each is denied to none.'" [15]

Now, for three hundred years this Divine organisation had ceased to exist in England. For a long time there was no Bishop at all, then came one alone; then for another interval there was again none at all; till some men began to say that a Bishop was not wanted, except to confirm. Then there were Vicars-Apostolic without diocese, or synod, or ordinary jurisdiction, not *veri pastores*, but Vicars and Delegates. Three centuries ran on and the Faith in England lived, not in a body, but in individuals; members of the Universal Church, indeed, but without their true pastors, and without the living organisation of the Church. From generation to generation the faithful pleaded and prayed for the successors of the Apostles set by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church as of old. But penal laws, and the state of the world, and many influences and agencies held back the day of restoration. It was a sore time of desolation. The Faith was invisible: families in every class fell away, multitudes were absorbed into the un-Catholic life of England, and disappeared. The Vicars-Apostolic did great works, but their hands were weakened. A Bishop "*cujus oves non sunt proprie*" is at a great disadvantage. His priests know him to be a Bishop but cannot see in him a father who ordains them as his sons, and a *verus pastor* who is bound to lay down his life for the flock. All the bonds of unity are loosened, and all the motives

[15] *Const. Dogmatica Prima, De Ecclesia Christi*, cap. 3.

of zeal are relaxed. Great things, however, were done in this informal, provisional, and transient state. Speaking of the state of England under the Vicars-Apostolic, the Bishop of Birmingham says:

"Both the authority and the machinery of a synod were wanting. There was neither Archbishop to preside, nor suffragans with their theologians to respond to his summons, nor chapters to send their delegates. There was no graduated rank among the clergy, as they complained. Even the Vicars-General were rather nominal than effective. The Vicars-Apostolic themselves met annually in London to take common counsel together; but, however useful those assemblies might be, they left each prelate standing in an authority that was isolated from that of his brethren. It was not like an organised province assembling in hierarchical order, in accordance with canonical forms, aided by the lights of the ablest of its clergy, and drawing out decrees of discipline from the vast code of the Ecclesiastical Common Law, shaped by experience to local requirements, and receiving the stamp of authenticity through a final revision by the Holy See."[16]

The restoration of the Hierarchy changed all this in a moment. Thirteen pastors, with thirteen flocks in thirteen dioceses, assigned each to each by the successor of Peter, began at once to exercise a Divine, ordinary, and immediate jurisdiction of their own, still further extended in its reach as delegates of the Holy See. A close personal insight into the needs of each diocese, and into every district of each diocese by a pastor responsible for every soul, and invested with adequate authority, has changed, so far as time and many infirmities permit, the condition of the Catholic faith in England. It is now incorporated in a visible and perfect Church, engrafted into the Church throughout the world. The mind and life and vital warmth of the

[16] *Restoration*, pp. 4, 5.

Catholic Church pervade it. The table of statistics given above affords but a faint representation of the change which has passed over the Catholic religion in England. Firm and inflexible as it ever was in faith, the narrowness of its churches and the fewness of its priests made the restoration of its solemnities of Divine worship and its daily practices of devotion almost impossible. Now they are in full observance. Our then state was too informal to have old traditions, and the absence of traditions has enabled us to restore all things by the traditions and usages of the Holy See. Four Provincial Councils and Diocesan Synods, held in many dioceses year by year, in others frequently, have carried the common law of the Church in its main provisions throughout England. What was under the plough has been brought not only under the spade but under the trowel. Of this our schools for the children of the poor are a noble example. It may be doubted whether a nobler example of zeal and self-denial in a priesthood living among the poor and in poverty themselves can be anywhere found than the Catholic poor-schools of England. An old writer says, "When the husbandmen sees a tree drooping with pallid leaves he knows that it has some harm in its root: so when you see a people without religion, *sine dubio cognoscis, quia sacerdotium ejus non est sanum*, you know without a doubt that its priesthood is not sound." We have, thank God, no such sign of decay.

If there can be one test of zeal for souls more certain than another, it is the state of the children in the poor-schools. Many motives prompt a priest to

visit the sick, or sit in the confessional, or preach without ceasing. But there is only one motive which keeps a priest regular, watchful, patient, and industrious in visiting and inspecting his schools, in teaching the children with his own lips, in hearing their confessions, and bringing them watchfully to Holy Communion. This is a work unexciting, monotonous, never ending, ever beginning, intolerable to even good men in whom the love of souls and the love of unostentatious work is not supreme. The condition of the great majority of our poor schools, the religious knowledge of the children, as tested and known year by year by the diocesan inspector, proves that the pastoral clergy in England have upon them the spirit of the Good Shepherd. If this alone had been done by the restored hierarchy in England, it would have been enough. But it is not all. The education and multiplication of the diocesan clergy, and the founding of seminaries, both lesser and greater, will mark this first period of the restored Church in England. The Bishops have not spent money in piling stones into costly sanctuaries, but in building up the living stones of "the tabernacle which the Lord hath pitched, and not man." It is this which has carried the hearts of the people with them. And it is this which makes us venture to hope that the too kindly words of the Bishop of Agen are not altogether far from truth. "The highest families in England, in returning to the truth, understand better their true interests. They freely allow the grace of vocation to take possession of their sons and their noblest offspring, and the Church has already right to be proud

of the good Bishops, the learned priests, the holy religious which it counts in its bosom. This is for that old stock made young again by the sap of Catholicism, a sure guarantee of vitality." [17]

No better words can close this article than those which the Vicar-General of Orleans addresses to the faithful in France. "If I were a man of the world I should wish to have, against all my sins, as a shield over my head and the head of my children, a priest who owes to me his education and his priesthood, and who, standing every morning at the altar, would be to me as a lightning conductor.

"Our forefathers, to expiate their faults, used to found a perpetual lamp before the Blessed Sacrament. Found a priest. That will be a better lamp, which will give to God more glory and to the world more light." [18]

[17] *Le Grand Péril*, p. 91. [18] Ibid. p. 152.

XVIII.

OUTDOOR RELIEF.

(*Fortnightly Review*, 1888.)

OUTDOOR RELIEF.

THE *Times* newspaper has stated that I have given countenance to the fallacy that under the Poor Law men have a natural right to work or to bread. It has also published a letter from Mr. Albert Pell, stating that my words imply a censure upon the whole administration of the Poor Law, and would countenance the giving of relief to men in their own homes.

I plead guilty to both of these impeachments, and in as few words as I can I will justify what I have said.

As to the first indictment, that the poor have a natural right to work or to bread, the *Times* thinks it sufficient to reply that there is no obligation upon any one to give work. If it had extended its argument to the other limb of the alternative it would have answered itself. But the *Times* wisely refrained from saying that there is no natural obligation on men to give bread to the hungry. This needs no proof, even apart from Christian law. The obligation, therefore, is universal, but those who can give work as the condition of earning bread have an alternative in which they are free to choose, while those who cannot give work are certainly not obliged by any natural law to do so. For them it is enough to give bread, which, if they can give, they are bound to give. Some men, therefore,

have an alternative and others none; but all are bound by natural obligations, if they can, to feed the hungry.

But it may be said that granting the obligation in the giver does not prove a right in the receiver. To which I answer that the obligation to feed the hungry springs from the natural right of every man to life, and to the food necessary for the sustenance of life. So strict is this natural right that it prevails over all positive laws of property. Necessity has no law, and a starving man has a natural right to his neighbour's bread.

I am afraid that those who speak so confidently about rights, obligations, and laws have not studied, or have forgotten, the first principles of all human positive law. If the law of property did not rest upon a natural right it could not long exist. They who deny it justify the dictum, *La propriété c'est le vol.* They who affirm that property rests upon a natural right cannot, without destroying their own assertion, deny that the first natural right of man is to live. Even self-defence issuing in the taking of the life of an aggressor is recognised as the natural right of self-defence. Before the natural right to live all human laws must give way; and this natural right in every man lays upon all men the correlative obligation to sustain the life of man when it is threatened with extinction. The law of natural charity recognises in each the same right to live, and imposes upon us all according to our power the obligation to sustain the life of others as we sustain our own.

On this foundation all Poor Laws from Queen

Elizabeth to the present day repose, as the text of those laws abundantly proves. Until 5 Eliz. c. 3, the relief of the poor was by voluntary contribution; it became compulsory by that statute,[1] which is described as "An Act touching divers orders of artificers, labourers, servants of husbandry, and apprentices." It goes on to say that there would be "good hope that the same law being duly executed should banish idleness, advance husbandry, and yield unto the hired persons, both in time of scarcity and in time of plenty, a convenient portion of wages."[2] The Act, therefore, contemplated the industrious classes. It provided also that all between twelve and sixty years of age, if not otherwise employed, should serve in husbandry. It prescribed also the hours of work, the time for meals, and the rate of wages to be fixed by the justices.[3] The 14 Eliz. c. 5 was "For the punishment of vagabonds and for the relief of the poor and impotent." It repealed the Acts of Henry IV., Edward VI., and the 5 Eliz. c. 3. It appointed "Overseers of the Poor;" it made it penal to give money to any rogue or vagabond or sturdy beggar; but it provided relief for those "who are whole and mighty in body and able to labour."[4] In the 18 Eliz. c. 3, the recital runs as follows: "To the intent that youth may be accustomed and brought up in labour and work, and then not grow to be idle rogues: and to the intent also that such as be already grown up in idleness and so are rogues at present may not have any just excuse in saying that they cannot

[1] Nicholl's *History of the English Poor Law*, vol. i. p. 156.
[2] Ibid. p. 158. [3] Ibid. p. 158. [4] Ibid. p. 161.

get any service or work, and be then without favour or toleration worthy to be executed, and that poor and needy persons may be set on work." In every city, town, and market-town, justices were enjoined to order "a competent stock of wool, hemp, flax, iron, or other stuff—by taxation of all—so that every poor and needy person, old and young, *able to work and standing in need of relief*, shall not, *for want of work*, go abroad begging, or committing pilferings, or living in idleness." Here the providing of work is expressly enacted for all who are able to work and are in need of relief; and if such persons should refuse to work, they were to be sent to the House of Correction.[5] These show the mind of the Legislature down to that date.

This Act was repealed by the 39 Eliz. c. 3 and 4; nevertheless, the mind and the intention remain the same. The Act provides that children shall be set to work. It still enacts the provision of wool, hemp, and other stock for work, and also competent sums of money for and towards the necessary relief of the lame, impotent, old, blind, poor, and not able to work. Then follows an enactment of mutual liability—that is, of parents to support their children and of children to support their parents.[6]

All this was again repealed by the 43 Eliz. c. 2, which statute is the foundation of the Poor Law down to the present day. It provides for compulsory assessment, and that for the four following purposes: "1. For the setting to work of children whose parents cannot support them. 2. For setting to work of all

[5] Ibid. p. 170. [6] Ibid. p. 186.

such persons, married or unmarried, having no means to maintain themselves, and who use no ordinary and daily trade of life to get their living by. 3. For providing a convenient stock of flax, hemp, wool, thread, iron, and other ware or stuff to set the poor on work. 4. For the necessary relief of the lame, impotent, blind, and such others amongst them, being poor and not able to work." It extended the mutual liability of maintenance to grandfathers and grandmothers. This provision shows what vigilant care was exercised to maintain the domestic life of the people, and all the obligations and charities which arise from the relations of kindred and of homes. I fail to recognise in these statutes an administration of the law by which the old and the helpless are removed from their children and their kindred into a workhouse as a condition of relief, still less the refusal of outdoor relief, except on the same condition whereby a family is sold up, their home broken up, in all probability never to be reconstituted, and the whole family, old and young, charged for ever upon the rates. This condition is known at this time to be absolutely refused by an immense multitude of our suffering and deserving poor; they will endure any privations of hunger and cold rather than break up their home, with its natural and Christian charities, the only possession and happiness left to them in life, by going into a workhouse. Stone-breaking and crank-working are well enough as a deterrent for loafers and criminals, but the workhouse is a cruel deterrent when offered to families who, by a wise assistance in time of

need, may be carried through the straits of winter when in want of work.

Both the spirit and the letter of the statutes of Elizabeth provide for the relief or the employment of such as be lusty, who, having their limbs strong enough to labour, may be daily kept in continual labour, whereby they may every one of them get their own living with their own hands. This provision is made even for those who may not be deserving. How much more does it include the deserving and the willing to work who are thrown out of employment by winter, which suspends a multitude of trades and industries, or by the vicissitudes which so often paralyse the employers of labour. The indiscriminate refusal of outdoor relief pauperises those who break up their homes and go into the workhouses, aggravates the poverty of those who refuse to break up their homes, multiplies the number of those who are idle, because they are not relieved by work, and drives multitudes into the dangerous classes, who become desperate and hardened.

Does not our present administration of the Poor Law, as compared with the old statutes, imply a decline of Christianity, and an application of political economy uncontrolled by the moral laws of human sympathy, and of the compassion which wealth owes to poverty?

XIX.

THE LAW OF NATURE DIVINE AND SUPREME.

(*The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, 1888.)

THE LAW OF NATURE DIVINE AND SUPREME.

CARLYLE says somewhere in his *History of the French Revolution*, "Nature rests on dread foundations, and Pan, to whose music the nymphs dance, has in him a cry which drives men distracted." The cry of Nature in behalf of starving men seems to have robbed some people of their wits.

The Atlantic cable has so fully explained the circumstances under which I appealed to the law of Nature that I hardly like to weary the reader with a repetition. Nevertheless, I may so far return upon the past as to say that my words were spoken in a Conference, not a mere public meeting, and written for use in one of our most literary, I may say esoteric, reviews.

My object was to show the foundations, both natural and legal, of our English Poor Law, and to prove that its administration has drifted from its first principles and deviated from its essential obligations. The relief of the poor in England until the 5 Elizabeth cap. 3 was by the voluntary action of private and ecclesiastical charity. Both in the tithes and in the lands of the Church the poor had a share by right. The *bona ecclesiastica* were described as "*Vota fidelium, pretia peccatorum, patrimonia pauperum*" (the oblations of

the faithful, restitution for sin, the patrimony of the poor). I am not one of those who believe that the relief of the poor before the suppression of the monasteries was adequately discharged by the monasteries. They were, indeed, a thousand centres from which alms daily flowed. But this must have been partial and local. Their lands were one-third of the land in England, but the population of the remaining two-thirds were not relieved by them. For these the palaces of the Bishops, the homes of the clergy, the castles of the rich, and the houses of the faithful at large afforded such relief as was given and received. The whole of this almsgiving was voluntary, springing from the law of Christianity, and resting ultimately on the law of Nature.

When the Act of Elizabeth made this natural obligation compulsory by law it did not extinguish nor suspend the Christian or the natural law. Nor did this law recognise only the *obligation* of those who possess by the positive and human law. It also recognised the natural *right* of the poor to share in the common sustenance of the earth.

Now, this high and sacred foundation of our Poor Law has been absolutely denied by many. It has been the habit to denounce it in all notes and tones. Even so moderate a man as Mr. Fawcett asks whether it might be wise and just to abolish the Poor Law, and answers only that "it would not be wise and just to abolish it precipitately." If put to the vote of the ratepayers I fear that it would certainly be abolished. But if there be a natural right in the poor to sustenance in

time of extreme need, the Poor Law can never be abolished. Nevertheless, even good and generous people do not know or remember that such a natural right, with its correlative natural obligation, exists. They pay their poor-rate, so they think, as a tax, or out of pure benevolence and gratuitous charity. This habit of mind rests on a denial of the rights and obligations of Nature, and generates an essentially erroneous and even immoral habit of mind. To combat this perversion of morals and to recall people, if possible, to a higher sense of duty, I affirmed that the foundation of our Poor Law is the natural right of the poor to work or to bread. The next morning the *Times* newspaper rebuked me for countenancing this "popular fallacy." Truths are not fallacies, and fallacies are not truths. To call it a fallacy is to call it a falsehood, and to propagate such a denial of truth both natural and Christian is fraught with consequences both harsh and dangerous.

It can hardly be necessary to justify what I have said among Catholics, I might even say among Christians; but both Catholics and Christians are often not fully aware of the broad and solid ground on which they habitually rest. I will, therefore, draw out in full what the other day I gave only in reference. I do this not out of pedantry, but out of prudence, for some good men may, for want of knowledge, be misled.

The doctrine of the Catholic Church may be briefly stated in the words of S. Thomas Aquinas, who sums up what had been always and everywhere taught before him; and his *Summa Theologica*, with the Holy

Scripture, has been laid open in Œcumenical Councils as the highest authority in the tradition of Catholic doctrine.

I. By the law of Nature all men have a common right to the use of things which were created for them and for their sustenance.

II. But this common right does not exclude the possession of anything which becomes proper to each. The common right is by natural law, the right of property is by human and positive law, and the positive law of property is expedient for three reasons:

1. What is our own is more carefully used than what is common.

2. Human affairs are better ordered by recognised private rights.

3. Human society is more peaceful when each has his own, protected by the law of justice: *suum cuique*.

III. Theft, therefore, is always a sin, for two reasons:

1. It is contrary to justice.

2. It is committed either by stealth or by violence.

IV. But the human and positive law cannot derogate from the natural and Divine law. According to the Divine law all things are ordained to sustain the life of man, and therefore the division and appropriation of things cannot hinder the sustenance of man in case of necessity. Therefore, also the possessions of those who have food superabundantly are due by the natural law for the sustenance of the poor. S. Ambrose, quoted in the "Decretals," says: "It is the bread of

the famishing that you keep back and the clothing of the naked that you lay by; the money you bury in the earth is the release and liberation of those who are in misery." [1]

For the sake of those who may not have ready access to the works of S. Alphonsus, the following passages may be given.

The text of Busenbaum is as follows: "*Qui pro se vel alio in extrema necessitate constituto alienum accipit quantum necessarium est, nec furatur nec tenetur restituere postea sic assumptum, si quidem re et spe indigens fuit.*"

It is to be remembered that S. Alphonsus consulted for his theology some eight hundred authors, and his decisions, therefore, rest upon the widest foundation, and may be safely followed.

S. Alphonsus says that this doctrine is *certain*, and is founded upon the doctrine of S. Thomas, that in such a case "all things are common;" for the law of nations, by which the division of goods was introduced, cannot derogate from the law of nature. "Though in extreme necessity a poor man has a right (*jus habet*) to the goods of others, he has not a right to the extraordinary goods of others, but only to those which ordinarily suffice for the sustenance of life." He says that "as the poor man has a right (*jus habet*) to take what he needs, no one ought to hinder his taking it." "Forasmuch as in extreme necessity all things are common, a rich man is bound in justice to give help

[1] S. Thomæ Aquin., *Summa Theolog.*, 2da 2dæ, quæst. lxvi. art. 1, 2, 5, 7.

to the poor, because the poor man may justly take it, even without the will of the owner" (*cum ille juste possit eam surripere etiam invito domino, et suam facere*). Throughout the whole treatise S. Alphonsus repeats over and over again the word *jus* or right possessed by the poor man.[2]

This doctrine lies at the foundation of the positive law of property in all Christendom. It exists as an unwritten law in all Catholic countries; in France it is the *droit au travail*, in England it is clothed in a legal statute in our Poor Law, under which every one has "a right either to work or to bread without work." In the old Scotch law it was recognised under the title of Burdensech: A starving man had a right to carry away as much meal as he could on his back. All these authorities I give not by way of example or exhortation to larceny, but in proof of the natural right from which they flow.

My friends in America have kindly sent me the newspapers which have commented upon my words, and I learn from them that the opinions of judges, barristers, and divines have been asked and obtained on what I have said. I have read their opinions with great care. Those of Judge Altfield, Judge Prendergast, Judge Baker, and Mr. Brady are calm, solid, and judicial opinions, all the more remarkable because, not having the context of my words before them, they were compelled, like comparative anatomists, to construct the whole skeleton by proportion and measurement.

[2] *Theologia Moralis*, lib. iii. tract v. cap. i. tom. i. pp. 333, 334, 335. Ed. Bassano, 1847.

In this they have shown a true judicial acumen, for which I thank them. Judge Waterman wisely says that to clothe the lawfulness of taking a neighbour's bread, in extreme necessity, in the form of a legal enactment would be unwise and mischievous. In this I fully agree. Such questions belong to conscience and moral theology. The right to bread or to work may be clothed in positive law, but to erect the lawfulness of breaking a law into an enactment would lead at least to confusion. I wish I could equally commend the answers of the divines. The discernment of jurists at once perceived the law of Nature which underlies all positive law. It may seem strange that the divines did not even more rapidly discern it. Any Catholic priest would have at once seen that the question was one not of courts of law, but of moral theology. But here moral theology hardly exists except in the Catholic Church. I do not pretend to know how this may be among the Protestant communions of America. I speak only of England. In the Established Church the chief and almost the only works of moral theology are Bishop Andrewes on the *Ten Commandments*, Jeremy Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium*, and Bishop Sanderson's *Cases of Conscience*. All three are nearly forgotten. Jeremy Taylor's works are voluminous, elaborate, and eloquent. He believed, however, that his chief and most enduring work would be his *Ductor Dubitantium*. It is simply forgotten. It is a large folio of casuistry, the nearest approach in Protestant literature to the moral theology of the Catholic Church. No one now but a student here and there reads it

Few even know of its existence. It forms no part of the education of non-Catholic divines. The truth is that three hundred years ago the chairs of Canon Law and Moral Theology were abolished.

It must always be borne in mind that my purpose was to justify and elevate the Poor Law of England, by showing that it was founded upon the natural right of man to life and to the sustenance of life. In proving this I was compelled to show that this natural law is supreme over all positive law. The two questions, though distinct, are indivisible, as we have seen in the texts already cited from S. Thomas and S. Alphonsus. The opponents of the Poor Law, to evade the main question, promptly seized on the latter to escape the former. My words were as follows: "The obligation to feed the hungry springs from the natural right of every man to life, and to the food necessary for the sustenance of life. So strict is this natural right that it prevails over all positive laws of property. Necessity has no law; and a starving man has a natural right to his neighbour's bread. I am afraid that those who speak so confidently about rights, obligations, and laws have not studied, or have forgotten the first principles of all human positive law. If the law of property did not rest upon a natural right it could not long exist. They who deny it justify the dictum, *La propriété c'est le vol.* . . . . Before the natural right to live all human laws must give way."[3] I gave the example of the natural law of self-defence, before which the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," gives way.

[3] *Fortnightly Review*, January 1888, p. 154.

The calm and business-like way in which you in America have treated this matter contrasts with the hasty utterances of some of my countrymen, and brings out the historical difference of your fresh and vigorous commonwealth as compared with our old, traditional, unreflecting society in England. We are like the Great Babylon of old, with its massive walls and gates and hanging gardens, on which time has no power. In our city of three days' journey the minds of men are slow to move. The past is forgotten in the present, the present is the rule of opinion; old truths revived are looked on as novelties and modern errors; whatsoever is the popular opinion of the day is supposed to be the tradition of all time. Most men believe that all things are as they were from the beginning, and that what is new to them cannot be true. Mr. Lowell has sketched to the life our confidence in the supremacy of our wisdom:

"England really thinks
The world is all in darkness if she only winks."

I have committed *lèse majesté* by rudely reminding some who rule over public opinion in London of the fresh mother earth and of the primeval laws which protect her offspring. I was unconscious of my audacity. I thought I was uttering truisms which all educated men knew and believed. But I found that these primary truths of human life were forgotten, and that on this forgetfulness a theory and a treatment of our poor had formed a system of thought and action which hardens the hearts of the rich and "grinds the faces of the poor." I am glad, therefore, that I said and wrote

what is before the public, even though for a time some men have called me Socialist and Revolutionist, and have fastened upon a subordinate consequence, and neglected the substance of my contention in behalf of the natural rights of the poor.

XX.

COMPENSATION TO THE DRINK TRADE.

(*Fortnightly Review*, 1888.)

COMPENSATION TO THE DRINK TRADE.

The political history of the last fifty years is marked by a development of the self-governing power of the English people greater than is to be found in any century of our annals. The frequent and large extension of the Parliamentary suffrage has placed in the hands of four or five millions of our people the direct power of modifying or controlling the legislation of Parliament. The national character, which is the growth of long tradition, and the political education, which is unconsciously received in some degree, greater or less, by a large multitude of Englishmen, render the possession of such political power comparatively safe. Nevertheless, we are suffering from a too great centralisation, which has overwhelmed Parliament with such a multiplicity of legislative matters as is absolutely beyond the power of any Legislature to deal with. A very large part of the matters which block and obstruct the Houses of Parliament ought to be dealt with locally; but there is no local organisation adequate to deal with them. We are in the condition described by Lammenais. He said: "La centralisation c'est l'apoplexie du cerveau et la paralysie des extremités." There is no doubt that we are suffering from a congestion of the Parliamentary brain, and from a palsy of the extremities of

the people. When, therefore, the Local Government Bill of the Ministry was first announced, it was received with a goodwill and a confidence seldom equalled since the year 1833. Men hoped to see Parliament become truly Imperial in the elevation of its legislative Acts, liberated from the crush and clamour of private Bills and petty interests, which have so long defeated its efforts and dishonoured its supreme prerogatives. They already began to foresee the vigorous and wide-spread development of municipal life in every county, and of the local and personal energies of intelligence and will which pervade the self-governing character of our people. But these bright hopes were rudely destroyed by the clauses which place the great drink traffic at the very outset of the Bill, as if it were the palladium of our liberties and the most vital interest of the Commonwealth.

The reaction which has set in, not against the high and statesman-like structure of local government, but against the housing, establishing, and endowment of the drink trade under the Imperial roof in this wise extension of the English Constitution, is widespread and profound. The drink trade, like the shirt of Nessus, so clings to the Bill as to be identified with it; and if it be not fatal to the Bill, it will be fatal to the moral and domestic life of the people.

Hitherto the great drink trade has been both tolerated and encouraged by law; nevertheless, its toleration has been subjected to rigorous limits. A license to sell intoxicating drink is not a personal favour granted to any man, but a legal limitation and

precaution taken against the trade. It is a restraint imposed upon all men, except the holder of the license, in order to restrict and to minimise the extent of the trade. It was in order "to put away tippling houses," and to restrict the number of places where intoxicating drink was sold, that the first licenses were granted in the time of Edward VI. They were legal restrictions intended, as far as possible, to lessen the evils of intemperance, which had already become enormous. They were of the nature of "faculties" or "privileges," given to men who were supposed to be trustworthy, and recommended by local testimony as fit to hold the responsible duty of checking the vice of intemperance. And even this license or permission was granted under two limitations. It was limited in time, and ceased at the expiration of the date assigned. It was limited also to good conduct, and was forfeited by any proved abuse. It created no personal claim beyond the letter of the license, no vested interest in the holder of the license, and, above all, no local privilege in the house where he carried on his trade. Such was in the beginning, such has ever been, and such is at this moment the nature of a publican's license. But the six clauses, from 9 to 14 inclusive, of the Local Government Bill would create a vested interest in the man and in his house of trade. The Government is already a sleeping partner in the drink trade, as every Budget shows. This Bill and Mr. Goschen's Budget will create as many sleeping partners as there are counties in England.

Every conceivable effort has been made of late years

by publicans, brewers, and licensed victuallers to establish their claim "of vested interest." How this claim has been dealt with by those who have treated it judicially may be known from the following facts. The Act 35 & 36 Vict. c. 27, s. 6, thus defines the tenure of a license: "It shall be in force for one year from the date of its being granted." The Act of 9 Geo. IV. c. 1, s. 13, says for one year "and no longer." Mr. Justice Stephen, in the Court of Queen's Bench, November 1882, said: "The Legislature says when we talk of a renewal of the license we do not mean that: but we mean a *new* license granted to a man who had one before." Mr. Patterson, in his book on the Licensing Acts, says of the Act of 1874: "There is nothing in this or other Acts to make it compulsory on the justices to renew the license any more than in ordinary cases." In the *Justice of the Peace*, in 1883, it was laid down that "the discretion of the licensing justices to grant, or refuse, or transfer a victualler's license is absolute; and they are not obliged to state any reason for their refusal." Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, in the Court of Queen's Bench, May 1878, said: "According to the Act of 1828, the justices had the same discretion to refuse a renewal as they had to refuse the grant of a new license." Viscount Cross, when Home Secretary, declared "that magistrates had just the same power to refuse renewals as they had to refuse new licenses." And Sir William Harcourt, when Home Secretary, in 1883, said: "The law is that every license is annual, and may be refused. The magistrates have the power to prohibit any sale." How, then, can

any man have a "vested interest" in a license, or a right of compensation if it be refused?

Mr. Justice Field, in the Court of Queen's Bench, November 1882, said: "In every case, in every year there is a new license granted. You may call it renewal if you like, but that does not make it an old one. The Legislature does not call it a renewal. The Legislature is not capable of calling a new thing an old one. The Legislature recognises no vested right at all in any holder of a license. It does not treat the interest as a vested one in any way." Baron Pollock, also, in the Queen's Bench, January 31st, 1884, said: "The notion that there is a property of the landlord in a license cannot be considered as sound law." The late Mr. Nash, barrister-at-law, and counsel to the Licensed Victuallers' Association, said: "Now, I am sorry to say, having looked into this question most exhaustively, and having compared notes with my brethren well versed in these matters, that there cannot be the smallest doubt that in the strict sense no such thing as a vested interest exists. . . . The mere mention of the term 'vested interest' should be avoided, as it infuriates every court, from the Queen's Bench downwards." [1]

Finally, Mr. Justice Field and Mr. Justice Wills, on Monday, April 30th last, united in the same judgment. Judge Wills said: "In 1874 a new license is defined as a license granted at a general annual licensing meeting, in respect of premises in respect of which a similar license has not been granted before;

[1] See pamphlet by Mr. Malins on "Compensation," p. 45.

which was a little modified from the definition of the Act of 1872, but only *to correct a mistake* from the use of the words 'licensed *premises*,' inasmuch as *premises never were licensed*, the license being in all cases a personal one."

The compensation clauses, therefore, of the Local Government Bill are not an old right, but a new gift to the publicans. They create a new law, and that by indirect action. If the Bill were entitled "To Amend the Licensing Laws," dealing openly and exclusively with the drink trade, the main issue would be raised upon its own merits. It now comes in by the way, enveloped in a Bill to which, in its constitutional effects, we have as earnestly wished God-speed as we resolutely resist and refuse its action in rooting and extending by new enactments the fatal traffic in intoxicating drink, which henceforward would become ineradicable. In saying this, we are speaking deliberately and calmly. Its roots would spread through the whole government, central and local, of England, which would be bound over by heavy pecuniary securities to protect and even to extend it.

The effect of creating a vested interest in publicans and public-houses would render it impossible to touch them without compensation; and the amount of compensation may be judged from a statement drawn up by Mr. Caine, based on careful inquiries. He writes as follows: "A new house was built at Newcastle-on-Tyne at a total cost for site, building, and incidental charges of 800*l*. A license from an old house was bought and removed to it, and its value rose to

6300*l.* The house was shortly afterwards sold for that sum. Under the proposed Bill it would be impossible to withdraw the license, even on grounds of public convenience, without compensation of 5500*l.* A house in Liverpool with a license, worth 2000*l.*, was bought by a brewer for 10,500*l.* The compensation would be 8500*l.* Another house in Liverpool, purchased a few years ago for 800*l.*, before the grant of a license, was lately sold for 8500*l.*; which would require compensation of 7700*l.* A gin-palace, near the docks, was built for less than 8000*l.* All the steamship owners in vain opposed the grant of a license. A leading brewer has offered 20,000*l.* for it, but the offer has been refused. The compensation would be 12,000*l.*" Other cases might be added; but it is enough to say that Mr. Caine calculates that the Government Bill would endow and protect the drink trade at the cost of 200,000,000*l.* or 250,000,000*l.* of money. This compensation would go not only to publicans, but also to brewers, and even still more to ground landlords. Surely the Government itself cannot have foreseen and weighed the consequences of these clauses of the Local Government Bill.

The records of our history show that from the time of Edward III. to this day Parliament has dealt with the drink trade, reducing and prohibiting its sale in England, Scotland, and Ireland, often by extensive and peremptory measures without a particle of compensation. In our Colonies, as in Canada, Local Option and temperance legislation have no shade of compensation. In the United States, as in Maine, Vermont

New Hampshire, Iowa, and Kansas, there is no compensation. A claim for compensation was brought in appeal before the United States Supreme Court. The appeal was dismissed.[1]

We may leave the question as a question of legal right, and, it may be hoped, also as a question of national policy. On this, if we were to begin to say anything, we should have to say much. But we will only add that the drink trade, which is growing every year, is our national sin, our national shame, and, if not arrested, will be our national ruin. It is destroying, more than any other malignant agent, the domestic life of our people, corrupting the manhood of our men, the womanhood of our women, and the innocence of our children.

But it may be said that, if there be no vested interest in strict law, there are equities by which a publican may claim compensation, as for money spent during his year of license upon improvement or enlargement of the house in which he carries on his trade. To this it must be answered: first, that he has had his compensation in his year of monopoly. He has prospered, to the exclusion of all his neighbours excepting those who are licensed monopolists like himself. The facts above quoted, of the sudden and enormous rise of value in houses where the trade is carried on, prove to demonstration the abundant profits upon a slender investment of capital. And next, that if he spends money upon a yearly tenure it is his own imprudence. And imprudence has no claims.

[1] Malins on "Compensation," pp. 10, 12.

Who compensates the victims of the drink trade? The havoc and wreck by disease, madness, poverty, crime, and death, of body and of soul, spread without measure through every class. Of all this a little is known to police or to public opinion; but to God, Who reads all the hidden calamities and miseries of private life, one abyss of human sorrow calls to another in the shadow of death. Legislators are bound by the most strict responsibility to know the manifold evils of the drink trade. In this no ignorance can be pleaded in excuse. They can know all, and are therefore bound to know, or to cease to make our laws. Whatsoever be the financial or political interests at stake, we are bound to say, "Salus populi suprema lex." Let all Bills and clauses perish; the salvation of the people is the supreme law.

XXI.

THE SOUL BEFORE AND AFTER DEATH.

(Bacon's *Unknown Land*, New York, 1888.)

THE SOUL BEFORE AND AFTER DEATH.

CHAPTER I.

1. If I am asked for a definition of the soul, I answer, "Est principium per quod homo sensitivus est, cogitat, et vult;" it is the principle by which man perceives, thinks, and acts; or again, more simply, "It is the principle of life, and of the vital acts of thought and will."

2. If I am asked for a definition of life, I say it is, "Activitas qua ens seipsum movet." By motion in man is intended not only physical, but intellectual, moral, and mental.

3. If any one shall ask for a metaphysical definition of principle, I answer, it is "that which produces anything." "Principium est id quod rationem continet, cur illud sit, cujus dicitur principium." The idea of principle is that out of which anything proceeds, as a tree from a root, or a stalk from a grain of wheat. And yet the word "principle" is not a metaphor of similitude, but of proportion: as a root to a tree, so a principle to its product. A root and a principle may be dissimilar in everything but in the one point of production, yet the analogy or ratio of proportion holds good. The mistaking of analogies for metaphors

or images is the source of endless confusion. It is like believing Providence to be an eye.

4. The soul is not something superadded to man or to human nature. Man has no existence till soul and body are united in one *suppositum*.

5. A material organism is not human nature, or man. Powers and emotions without a principle do not constitute man. They are not produced by organism. The onus of proof lies on those who say so.

6. Matter is not the *principium vitæ:* for the greater mass of matter is without life.

7. Matter is not even organic till an organism supervenes.

8. But organism does not give life, for large regions of organised matter exist without life. Therefore,

9. The union of matter and organism, neither of which gives life, does not give life.

10. No material organism, therefore, can be the principle or cause. Nor can it be 'the base or the nidus' of life: unless life supervene as a distinct element. The subject, then, is lifted above all mere material organism.

11. Organised matter, "superveniente vita vegetativa," becomes a plant. This supervening of another and higher element creates a new kingdom of organic being: but the vegetative life is not contained in nor produced by either matter or organism: nor by both. Life is heterogeneous to that which is lifeless, *i.e.* to matter, but not to plant, or animal, or man.

12. Organised matter, "superveniente vita sensi-

tiva et animali," creates another and still higher kingdom of organised being, which, from its highest element, we call animal. But organised matter has in itself neither animal life, nor sensation, nor the perceptions of sense. All these are beyond its limits.

13. Nevertheless, there can be no animal life without material organism as the condition of its manifestation and exercise, though the animal life is distinct from it.

14. This animal *life* is called by courtesy "anima brutorum;" but when the material organism is dissolved, the life ceases to live and to exist, "conditione naturæ debita," by a law of Nature ordained by the Creator, the lower animals having no moral personality, no probation, and no judgment after death, The term of their existence is in and of this world : and their end, the service and use of man. All mere animal life is therefore mortal.

15. An organism which is material, sentient, and animal, "*superveniente vita intellectiva, rationis et voluntatis*," is man : or "natura rationalis," or "animal rationale." But reason and will are no more powers or functions of matter, or organism, or vegetable or animal life, than these are of organism and matter.

16. Organism is a higher element or perfection superinduced upon matter, vegetable life is a perfection superinduced upon material organism, animal life upon all these, and the rational life upon all these again; yet it is distinct from all, and independent in its higher functions of all. And this higher element is the "*principium operationum vitalium*"—*i.e.* of *reason*

and *will*—and by these terms we understand a rational nature, or a human soul.

17. This "*principium*," or soul, is independent of external sense in many of its highest functions—*e.g.* in the formation of abstract ideas, as of goodness, justice, and the like—in judgment of the agreement or disagreement of terms, and in the philosophical processes of induction and deduction, in mathematical reasoning, in discernment of good and evil, in the consciousness of the facts of internal sense; in all these and many more the rational powers of man are independent of sense, and abide in an inward world of our personal consciousness.

18. Now, the soul does, indeed, perceive by the senses all objects proper to the senses; but this is a lower function of the rational nature. Its chief and higher prerogative is its independence of all matter, both in its *existence* and in its *activity*.

19. It is for those who deny the existence of the soul after death, or for those who make the soul a function or a power of a material organism, to prove that matter or organism can possess the powers of thought and will. We affirm it to be repugnant to the order and facts of nature to make thought a function or power of matter which is not capable in and by itself even of sense. But no proof has ever been offered, except that the scalpel has not yet found the soul. If you say matter, we know, but soul we do not know. I answer, not knowing disproves nothing.

20. When Horace said, "Non omnis moriar"—"I shall not all die"—or the whole of me will not die

—he did not only mean that he would live in his "Odes" and "Satires." He meant that he was conscious of something in himself independent of the body, which would survive when the body should die. He meant to say, My poems and I will live on when this material organism, in which and by which I feel, and have cognisance of sensible things, shall be dissolved. Thus that which distinguishes me from the world of irrational animals cannot be affected by the dissolution of the material organism in which I eat and drink.

21. The denial of this would make us read, "Omnis omnino moriar"—I shall altogether die, or I shall die every bit of me, and leave nothing behind but my memory, good or evil, and old clothes.

22. The dissolution of the material organism withdraws from sense the phenomena of a personal mind and agency; but it in no way proves that the personal mind has ceased to exist. It in no way proves the cessation of that which existed and acted independently of sense. But reason and will are, and act independently of sense. Reason and will are not the phenomena of matter; they are intrinsically independent of matter, as in thought and volition; though they may also act through and upon matter, as by the eye, or by the arm. They are independent of our material organisation: (1) in consciousness of existence; (2) in the *sensus intimus;* (3) in the perceiving of internal facts of intellectual and moral consciousness; (4) in abstract reasoning; (5) in the power of numbers; (6) in moral sense.

3. I therefore affirm that the person, the principle

and radix of rational operations, and therefore the rational operations themselves, cannot be proved to cease, because the material organism which man has in common with the lower animals, with plants, and with crystals, is dissolved.

24. The *onus probandi* lies wholly on those who assert it. The personal survival is in possession, and cannot be dispossessed till it is turned out of the consciousness of mankind by evident reason.

25. But we may go further. Thought and will are not material. Therefore they are not dissoluble. The radix of thought and will, which I would call rational soul, if people would let me, is, like its products, not material, therefore not dissoluble. I affirm this on a self-evident law of all existences; every product is homogeneous with its root. The vital actions of the soul are immaterial, that is, simple, therefore indissoluble, and therefore, unless by the intervention of some other law, imperishable.

26. In the case of the lower animals, which have a vegetative and sentient life, there is this other law: the sphere and term of their existence is in their transient state. They serve man in this earthly period. They have no moral personality, no probation, no judgment to come. The law of their creation is that their life should be terminable. When the material organism is dissolved, the ox dies. "Omnis moritur." He dies every bit of him. There is no life extending beyond and independent of the material organism. Like the vine and the cedar, so the ox serves man and dies by the law of its own nature.

27. But of man none of these predicates can be made. There is that in him which lives, feels, thinks, wills, independently of matter. He can both act through his material organism and independently of it: "Animus velox sine corpore currit."

28. Nay. further, there is strong presumption that the vital actions of thought and will are even extended after the dissolution of the material organism through which they acted before death. It localises. narrows, confines them. The body is mensurable in quantity. The "vita intellectiva" has no mensurable quantity in *genere continui*—that is, as bodies have. It rests, again, upon the objectors to do what has not been done yet—I mean, to show that thought and will cease when the body dies. The presumption is not only that they live, but that they are extended in their range and their activity.

29. Such was the judgment of Aristotle, who may be taken as the highest witness of the evidence of natural reason. In the Tenth Book of the "Ethics" he says that happiness, εὐδαιμονία, after death will consist not in well-doing, or εὐπραξία, as in this life, because there will be none to whom we can do good, for there will be none who need it; but in θεωρία, or contemplation, by which he affirms the survival of the vital operations of the intellectual life; and if it be bliss, it implies the extension and perfection of the intellectual power, and therefore of the nature or radix from which they spring: or, as he would say, and we may say with him, of the ψυχή or soul.

30. I have affirmed with all, except those who

deny the existence of the soul as an immaterial entity, that it is in its nature uncompounded, or incomposite —that is, it is made up of no parts or elements which, as they cohere, so they may be dissolved. It is, therefore, absolute in its simplicity.

31. But what is simple cannot be dissolved.

(1) It has no separable or soluble elements.

(2) It is indestructible by external force.

(3) It cannot commit suicide. Eternal death is eternal life of evil and remorse.

32. Therefore the soul survives, that is, it lives on, *eadem numero*, in all its personal identity after death. Its state is changed: its identity is not changed. To use modern terminology, the physical Ego is changed, so far as the material organism: the psychical Ego is not changed, for extension of its sphere, energy, and powers is not change, but perfection.

33. The *reliquiæ* upon earth, by word, by action, by writing, survive not personally, but in the intelligence and will, in the life and formation of other men and of nations. But this is not a survival of the soul, but of the work wrought by the soul. It is impersonal in itself, and exists only in the persons of other men.

34. The sum of my argument is this:

(1) That matter as such has no life in itself.

(2) That organism as such has no life in itself. Therefore,

(3) That organised matter has no life in itself, for neither element can give what it has not.

(4) That organised matter plus vegetative life becomes a plant.

(5) That vegetative life is heterogeneous as regards matter and organism, and therefore is not contained in them, but it is the *differentia* or necessary constituent part of a plant.

(6) That organised matter plus sentient and animal life becomes an animal nature.

(7) That this sentient and animal life is heterogeneous as regards the matter and organism, but is the necessary *differentia* of an animal nature.

(8) That a material organism plus vegetative, sentient, and intellectual life becomes human nature.

(9) That this intellectual life is heterogeneous as regards the matter and organism of the body, and also the vegetative and animal life, but it is the necessary *differentia* which constitutes the human species or human nature. Without it, humanity or man does not exist.

(10) That the dissolution of the material organism affords no proof of the cessation of the intellectual life, because the intellectual life is not material. It is heterogeneous as regards matter, and therefore not included in the same laws.

(11) That the cessation of the vegetative life, when the material organism is dissolved, is no proof of the cessation of the intellectual life in man, which is heterogeneous as regards the vegetative life, and not subject to the same laws.

(12) That the cessation of the animal life is no proof of the cessation of the intellectual life, because the intellectual life is heterogeneous as regards the

animal life, and is not included in the same laws and destinies.

(13) From this I conclude that the death of the body affords no proof of the cessation of the intellectual life. But the intellectual life is the vital action of the soul. Therefore the soul does not die with the body, but survives when the body dies.

35. Finally, "*Non omnis moriar*" is a consciousness of my rational nature. It clings to me at every moment. It is confirmed by my hopes and by my fears, by the dictates of my reason and by the instincts of my heart, by my conscious relation to a Supreme Law-Giver, by my whole sense of moral responsibility to Him, and by a sleepless anticipation of an account, a balancing, and a completion hereafter of my moral life and state now. And this consciousness is not derived from sense, nor dependent upon sense. I am more sure of its truth than of any reports of sense, and of any syllogisms of logic. Moreover, what I find in my own consciousness I find to exist in the consciousness of others; and not of one or two here and there, but of all about me. And I read of it as having existed in all men, at all times, and in all places. And this *communis sensus* of men is a certain evidence of truth, not so much by reason of the number or multitude of witnesses, as by the universal voice of human nature, which is the voice of its Maker and of its Judge.

CHAPTER II.

THE argument thus far rests upon the observed facts of Nature. Sceptics may deny the arguments, but they cannot deny the facts. And how much soever they may deny the arguments, they cannot prove their denial by reason. I have affirmed that the consciousness of a personal identity which will survive the death of the body has been universal in the human race. So far as any records remain, evidences of this belief continually appear, both explicitly or implicitly.

1. For, first, it is certain that all mankind has seen and suffered death. The first sight of death—whether it came by murder or by disease matters not—must have raised the question of the future. To suppose that the father and mother, the kindred surviving the dead, thought only of the body without life, and had no care or even curious thought of the life or the living and personal identity which had been their joy, is an incredible imagination, or, I will say, a heartless and senseless scepticism.

2. But every generation of man, and every man in every generation, has been familiar with death from the beginning of the world; the funeral rites of all nations have compelled men to think of death, and of the state after death. It may with truth be said that a belief in the existence of God, and of the soul, and of its survival after the death of the body, pervaded the consciousness of the old world so profusely as to degenerate not into atheism, but into polytheism and pantheism; not into materialism, but

into the *anima mundi;* not into Comtism or Agnosticism, but into the elaborate visions of Elysian Fields and of the Plutonian realms. Atheism and materialism are modern aberrations from the consciousness of the human race.

3. If it be said that the rearing of pyramids and the embalming of bodies in the Egyptian dynasties signified only the memory of the past, I must answer that this is to beg the question. If it proves nothing, it disproves nothing. To perpetuate the memory of the past is to imply a hope of a perpetuity to come.

4. However this may be, it is certain that the literature of Greece and Rome is pervaded by a belief not only of a future state, but of a retributive justice which will dispense happiness or misery, according to justice and mercy. Homer and Virgil are proof enough. The words "Quisque suos patimur manes"[1] affirm survival and a retribution. But perhaps it will be said that in proportion as the human intellect advanced in cultivation, scepticism as to the existence of God, of the soul, and of its survival after death, rose into the ascendent. We are told that Aristotle did not believe in God, and that Cicero was a sceptic. It may not be amiss to let them speak for themselves, for they are, without doubt, the two culminating intellects of the Greek and of the Roman race.

5. So far were the highest intellects of the Greek world from disbelieving the existence of the soul, that they each one had a theory of its nature. Alcmæon said that it was in perpetual motion and immortal;

[1] *Æneid*, lib. vi. 744.

Diogenes, that it was air; Democritus, that it was fire and motion; Anaxagoras, that it was essentially distinct from everything else, the source of motion endowed with cognitive power, and separate from all without. Empedocles thought it to partake of the four elements, with love and hatred as principles of motion; Pythagoras held it to be a mixture of contrary elements and qualities, with an universality of cognition; Xenocrates said that the soul is a number (or indivisible unity) moving itself. Last of all, Plato unites psychology, or the sciences of the soul, with cosmology, or the science of the world. He thought the world to be a Divine immortal being, having a rotatory body and a rational soul, with cognition and motive power. He believed every man to possess a debased copy of the perfect rational soul of the cosmos or world. [2] All this is quoted not for pedantry, but to show how far they are from the truth who imagine that the intellects of the old world were unconscious of the soul. They so profusely believed in its existence as to speculate intensely as to its nature. In all their diversities they believed it to be something independent of the material body, and in its separate state to be:

> "A devouring flame of thought,
> A naked and eternally restless mind." [3]

6. All these theories were too indefinite and too vague for Aristotle. He believed the soul to be a *form* which brings the potential into actuality; a substance endowed with energy and motion. The highest ele-

[2] Grote's *Aristotle*, c. xii. "De Anima." London, 1880.

[3] Arnold's "Empedocles on Etna."

ment in the soul, he says, is νοῦς, or the intelligence or reason; and the perfection of the soul is, according to him, in the highest energy of the highest part or power of the soul exercised on the highest matter subject to it.[4] He adds, that even well-doing to others is less perfect than contemplation of the Divine; and that perfect happiness is in contemplation. Therefore the life of the gods is the happiest. But they have no deeds of well-doing to discharge. So, also, when well-doing is impossible to men, what remains but contemplation? and men only are capable of contemplation. "The whole life of the gods," he says, "is blessed; and of men in the measure in which there is a likeness of this energy"[5] of contemplation. "But such a life as this would be better than the life of man. For it would not be living as a man, but as there is something Divine in him."[6] This happiness of the intelligence is not in this life only, for Aristotle holds the νοῦς or reason of man to be immortal. Apart from Revelation, no one has approached so near to the immortality of the soul and to the Beatific Vision. Aristotle says also that of all living beings, man alone is capable of happiness, because he alone is capable of the higher life; and from this higher life he excludes those who live in vicious or the lower enjoyment of human pleasures or passions.

7. The intellectual tradition of the Greek world passed into the ruder and more material Roman mind; and we may find it fully represented in the first book

[4] Arist., *Ethic Nicom.*, lib. x. c. vii. [5] Ibid. lib. x. c. viii.
[6] Ibid. c. vii. 185

of Cicero's Tusculan Disputations on *The Contempt of Death*, which he rests upon the belief of immortality. After reciting the opinions or philosophies of the Greeks, he says: "Many contend against this, and inflict death on the mind, as if it were under capital sentence; and for no other reason is the eternity of the mind incredible, but because they cannot understand or comprehend in thought of what kind the mind is out of the body." But he adds, "To me, when I contemplate often the nature of the mind, it is much more difficult and more obscure to conceive what the mind is in the body as in a strange house, than what it is when it shall have gone out, and come into the free heaven as if into its own home. For unless we are unable to understand what anything is which we have never seen, we are certainly able to comprehend in thought both God Himself and the Divine mind liberated from the body." He goes on to say, "We are not our bodies, nor in saying this am I speaking to your body, but to you."[7] Cicero then quotes the argument of Socrates in the *Phædo* of Plato: "That which is always in motion is eternal; but that which gives motion to another, being itself moved from some other source, when the motion comes to an end, necessarily comes to the end of life. That only which moves itself never ceases to be moved, for it is never deserted by itself. . . . Forasmuch as it is evident that whatsoever moves itself is eternal, who can deny that this nature is imparted to the mind?"[8] "Homer," he says, "transferred human nature to the gods. I

[7] *Tusc. Disp.*, lib. i. xxii. [8] Ibid. xxiii.

had rather transfer Divine things to us. What are these Divine things? To live, to know, to discover, to remember. Therefore the mind (which, as I say, is Divine) is, as Euripides dares to say, God. And, indeed, if God or the soul (*anima*) is fire, such also is the mind of man: for as that heavenly nature is free from earth and moisture, so the mind of man is free from both of these. But if there be a fifth nature (element), which Aristotle first introduced, this is the nature both of gods and of minds."[9] Cicero then sums up his own opinion in a passage from his work *De Republica* as follows: "No origin of the mind can be found on earth; for in the mind there is nothing mixed or concrete, or which seems to be born or fashioned of the earth, there is nothing of moisture, or air, or fire. For in these natures there is nothing that has the power of memory, or intelligence, or thought, capable of retaining the past, of foreseeing the future, or of embracing the present; which powers are Divine alone. nor will any source be ever found whence they can come to man except from God. The nature and power of the mind is, therefore, singular, apart from all usual and known natures; so that whatsoever it be that feels and knows, and lives and acts, is heavenly and Divine, and for that reason it is by necessity eternal. Nor can God Himself, Who is understood by us, be understood in any other way except as an intelligence, independent and free, separate from all mortal admixture, perceiving and moving all things, having in itself eternal motion."[10] These passages are given in full in

[9] *Tusc. Disp.*, xxvi. [10] Ibid. xxvii.

order to show that a belief in the existence of the soul pervaded the ancient world not as a superstition of gross minds, but as a result from the most searching analysis of the nature of man. It pervaded the unanalysed consciousness of mankind, as the witness of personal identity of which no man could doubt, and it was confirmed by the introspection and severe ratiocination of the highest intellects of the old world. These two witnesses from the Greek and Roman races are not isolated testimonies. They sum up and lay bare the most advanced thoughts of the human intellect external to the light of Revelation. They so profoundly realised the existence, and it may be said the necessary existence, of a nature higher and nobler than matter, that they conceived the world to have a soul, and that soul Divine. The modern materialism and the pollarded Catholicism of Comte have no root in the old world. They are the last word of the philosophy of sense, and are at variance with the history of the human mind. Such works as Cudworth's *Intellectual System* ought to have rendered impossible such deviations from the rational tradition of mankind.

CHAPTER III.

Our argument hitherto amounts to this: that the lights of nature make known to us the existence of the soul as distinct from the body; that there is no reason to show that the death of the body involves the death of the soul; and, lastly, that the lights of nature

affirm the survival of the soul. Further, that belief in the existence of the soul and its survival after the death of the body has pervaded the human race, and that these truths were perceived and unfolded in the measure in which the intellectual culture of men advanced, and culminated in the chief intellects of the Greek and Roman worlds.

It is, therefore, contrary to the history of mankind to suppose that the existence of the soul and a future state are made known to us only by Revelation. They are truths of the natural order—doctrines of natural religion, known from the beginning, and believed by all mankind. If any sceptics or unbelievers in these truths were to be found, they were as the handful of the blind among all men who see. The evidences of natural religion are so manifest and abundant that those who do not believe the power and divinity of God are inexcusable.[11] Even they who refuse to believe in Christianity are here in contradiction with the lights of nature.

1. We may now go on to the witness and teaching of the Catholic Church. The preambles of faith include the large and luminous religion or theology of nature, the existence and perfections of God, the existence, spirituality, and immortality of the soul, the power and freedom of the will, the eternal distinction of right and wrong, the moral law based upon it, the responsibility of man to the Law-giver, the rewards and penalties attached to the law, the awards of retribution after death. All these are known by the

[11] Rom. i. 20.

light of nature, and by the law written upon the heart of mankind. [12]

2. This religion of nature is carefully guarded by the Church, forasmuch as it is a primeval revelation of God "by the works which He has made." It is taken up and fulfilled in the revelation of faith. Again and again, even in our day, the supreme authority of the Church has vindicated and affirmed the certainty of the religion of nature.

In 1848 the Holy See authoritatively declared that "the use of reason is able to prove with certitude the existence of God. Faith is a heavenly gift which comes after by revelation, and therefore cannot fittingly be alleged against atheists in proof of the existence of God." [13] Again, in 1855, the same authority declared that "the use of reason is able to prove with certitude the existence of God, the spirituality of the soul, the liberty of man. Faith follows by revelation, and therefore cannot be fittingly alleged against atheists to prove the existence of God, nor against materialism and fatalism to prove the spirituality and liberty of the rational soul." [14]

And in 1870 the Vatican Council, having before it not any new heresy or mutilation of Christianity, but the materialism, naturalism, and rejection of the lights and laws of nature, which for three hundred years have been spreading like the stifling sand of the desert over the face of Christendom, began its work by summing up and republishing the religion of nature. It teaches

[12] Rom. ii. 14, 15.
[13] Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, 1488, p. 441.
[14] Ibid. 1506, p. 452.

as follows: "That there is one true and living God, Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, almighty, eternal, immense, incomprehensible, infinite in intelligence, in will, and in all perfections, Who, as being one sole absolutely simple and immutable spiritual substance, is to be declared as really and essentially distinct from the world, supreme in beatitude in and from Himself, and ineffably exalted above all things which exist, or are conceivable except Himself.

"This one only true God, of His own goodness and almighty power, not for the increase or acquirement of His own happiness, but to manifest His perfection by the blessing which He bestows on creatures, and with absolute freedom of counsel, created out of nothing from the beginning of time both the spiritual and corporeal creature—that is, the angelical and the mundane—and afterwards the human creature as partaking of both—that is, of spirit and of body." [15]

In this declaration of faith is contained the solution of all the questions of Greek and Roman speculations, religious and philosophical. The Revelation of Jesus Christ "has brought to light life and incorruption by the Gospel." [16] It has cast a light upon the life of man, which was obscurely comprehended before, and upon incorruption, which was dimly seen in the simplicity and eternity of the mind. Revelation, or the illumination of supernatural truths, does not only bring things which lie beyond the horizon of nature within the intelligence of man, but it fills the whole world

[15] *Dogmatic Constitution on Catholic Faith*, c. i.
[16] II. Tim. i. 10.

with a light in which the primeval truths of the natural order become self-evident and complete.

3. It would be waste of time and of words to prove what even unbelievers admit—namely, that both the Jewish and the Christian world have believed that God and the soul, and the responsibility of the soul to God, both in this life and after death, are, and have ever been, the faith and consciousness of men.

We have seen that Aristotle held that *form* is of a higher nature than *matter:* that form gives actuality or actual existence to matter; and is, therefore, the cause why anything has its special and proper existence. He says that mind, or νοῦς, is the form which constitutes human nature, and that it is a likeness of the Divine, or, indeed, θεῖον τι, something Divine in us. In like manner the Church teaches that the soul is the form of the body; that the body is concrete and corruptible; that the soul being spiritual is incorruptible; that the body will be dissolved; that the soul cannot be dissolved; that we shall survive the death of the body, and give account of all things done in the body, "whether it be good or evil." [17]

4. We have travelled a long way and over a heavy soil to reach this point—namely, what is the state after death? But it has seemed better to review the whole subject in outline, and to show that while reasoning cannot disprove the survival of the soul after death, the consciousness and the reasoning of the old world and of the new—that is, of the whole human race—has borne steadfast witness to a day of reckon-

[17] II. Cor. v. 10.

ing to come, and that the state of the soul after death will be determined by its state and acts in this life.

5. We must now define what we mean by a future state. Does the term *state* signify a locality and its circumstances, or a subjective condition of those who are in it? Or does it signify both? In its primary and proper sense a state is a stable and permanent condition of anything, whether of a person or of his surroundings. There can be no state of anything which has ceased to exist, unless we are pleased to say that the body returns to the state of dust. But in speaking of the soul it signifies existence or incorruption, the indissoluble unity of the soul in its life and simplicity.

6. But it signifies or involves something more than this. It has a moral sense. The soul in this life passes from what is potential into what is actual. Its powers, capacities, faculties, affections, and passions, for good or for evil, for rectitude or for distortion, for conformity or, as Aristotle says, for likeness to a Divine life, or for deformity and degradation, are unfolded in this life. The soul or the man becomes good or evil, pure or impure, true or false, just or unjust, and the ultimate shape, or attitude, or colour of the soul at the death of the body, so far as we know by nature, is thenceforward fixed, stable, and permanent. As we live, so we die; as we die, so we shall be. There is nothing in the lights of nature to suggest or even to hint that those who die in the actual form of evil can pass after death into the actual form of good. If reason cannot affirm even the extinction of the soul

with the body, much less can it make any predicates whatsoever as to the state of the soul after the death of the body. The only answer I know is, "I do not believe in souls," or "I do not know that the soul exists after death." This is a cheap answer. But it has against it the belief of the whole world, old and new; and want of knowledge disproves nothing; and disbelief is an act not of the pure reason only, but also of the will. The reason may be averted or perverted by a will that is biassed or bribed.

7. We may lay down, then, that there is a state of the soul after death, and that, for good or for evil, it is fixed at death, and eternal.

8. That this twofold state is one either of happiness or of misery is undeniably manifest by the analogy of nature, and by the facts of our moral life in this world. The just, pure, upright, and merciful, in spite of all sorrow and suffering from without, have a mental happiness of their own internal and immutable. If that state were fixed, raised to a perfect fulness, shielded from the outward evils and sorrows of this life, and made perpetual after death, it would be a state of bliss. For heaven is essentially not only a place, but a character; a conformity to the perfections of God, and a capacity to enjoy them by a kindred nature. Even Aristotle could see this in his ὁμοίωμά τι τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνεργείας. We may say of him in the words of Tertullian, *O anima naturaliter Christiana.* So also that the unjust, impure, false, and cruel, with all their wilful indulgence of low enjoyments of passion, and, all the more, in the measure of their unlimited

indulgence of sense, are in this world unsatisfied, craving, insatiable, disappointed, baffled, jealous, resentful, and full of sorrows: and not of sorrows only, but of pains, which are penal consequences of their lawless and wilful enjoyment of devouring lusts: all this is as certain and as visible as the laws which govern the tides. But the moral world is a counterpart of the natural world. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked: whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. He that soweth in his flesh, of the flesh also shall reap corruption: but he that soweth in the spirit, of the spirit shall reap life everlasting."[18] These are, indeed, the words of Revelation; but what do they affirm beyond the affirmations of Aristotle, who, in ascribing a blessed life to those who have in them a likeness to the Divine life, expressly excludes those who by living in lower and evil enjoyments have no such likeness to the Divine? What is this but the vision of peace, and the *pœna damni* the pain of loss, the privation which is wilfully earned by a corrupt life? "The wages of sin is death."[19] The wages are earned and will be paid. The labourer is worthy of his hire, and his master is not God.

9. There are, and there can be, only two states in this life or after death. "He that is not with Me is against Me." If our will is not conformed to God's will, it is at variance with it. There is no neutrality: neutrality is treason. Even Seneca could say that "the soul is God dwelling in us;" and the soul is our life, and united with God is eternal life. So the soul at vari-

[18] Gal. vi. 7, 8. [19] Rom. vi. 23.

ance with God is separated from Him, and separation from God is eternal death.

10. We are now among the lights of the supernatural order, and we might confirm our reasoning by a multitude of citations from the Divine Tradition of the Faith. But I refrain from all details. They are well known to those who believe; those who cavil would cavil still. It is enough to give the outlines which are derived from the light of reason and from the illumination of faith. There is a state of happiness after death for all who die in union with God. It is inchoate in the realm of purification; it is made perfect in the Vision of Bliss. So also there is a state of pain after death for all who die *culpably* separated from God: that is, the loss or privation of God in the outer darkness, "where the worm dieth not:" in other words, an eternal remorse for wilful self-murder. There is also a pain "where the fire is not quenched." So the Redeemer and Judge of men has declared. It is not for us to contradict or to explain away His words. They are for our warning. The obedient will need no interpretations. I have said culpably, because as no one will be saved except by the grace of God, so none will be lost except by his own will. Every soul that loses the vision of God dies by its own hand. No one will be lost because he dies, geographically, out of the Church, but culpably out of it by wilful resistance to the known truth. We are taught by the Divine Teacher that there is forgiveness for all who know not what they do. Responsibility is measured by knowledge. No man can be ignorant of the truths which are taught by the light of nature. Of

these truths no ignorance is invincible. The works of God preach them in all the world.

11. No man is responsible for not knowing the One Name by which we are saved, the one baptism for the remission of sin, the one fold of the one Shepherd, to whom these truths have never been made known. The ignorance, therefore, of the heathen world, until the Divine Witness speaks to them, is, both physically and morally, invincible. God has not revealed to us how He will deal with those who have never heard the name of Jesus; but He has revealed to us that His mercies are over all His works; that He so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that all who believe in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life; that Jesus has tasted death for every man; that He is the Lamb that taketh away the sin of the world; that He would have all men "to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth;" "that the Spirit of the Lord has filled the whole earth." Resting upon these Divine foundations, the Head of the Church has condemned those who said: "Pagans, Jews, and heretics, and others of this kind, receive no influx (of grace) from Jesus Christ; and from this fact the inference is right that in them the will is bare and unarmed, being altogether without sufficient grace."[20] This is contrary to the Faith. Catholic theology teaches that "to all men of age of responsibility, even infidels, grace is given, either proximately or remotely, sufficient for salvation."[21] As in Adam all die, so all in Christ shall

[20] Alexander VIII.
[21] Hurter, *Theol. Dogm. Compend.*, tom. iii. pp. 51, 52.

be made alive. S. Thomas affirms that, "If any man reared up in the forests, and among the brute animals, should follow the guidance of reason in the desire for good and the avoidance of evil, it is most certainly to be held that either God by internal inspiration will reveal to him what it is necessary to believe, or will send to him a preacher of the Faith, as He sent Peter to Cornelius." Orosius, the disciple of S. Augustine, writes: "My firm and undoubted conviction always is that God gives His grace not only in His body, which is the Church, to which, for the faith of those who believe, He bestows special gifts of His grace, but also to all nations in the world He bestows it, through His long-suffering and eternal mercy day by day, by times and seasons and moments, and to all and to every one." [22] They who know the only revealed way through the vision of faith to the vision of God in eternity are bound by the law, "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus," to obey the Spirit of Truth. They who might know the truth if they had the will are bound to search until they know it. They who neither physically nor morally can know it are in the hands that were pierced for them on the Cross, and the Eternal Love has many mysteries of His unrevealed grace which are not written in our theology.

[22] Hurter, *Theol. Dogm. Compend.*, tom. iii. p. 53.

XXII.

THE CHURCH ITS OWN WITNESS.

(*North American Review*, 1888.)

THE CHURCH ITS OWN WITNESS.

The Vatican Council, in its Decree on Faith, has these words: "The Church itself, by its marvellous propagation, its eminent sanctity, its inexhaustible fruitfulness in all good things, its catholic unity and invincible stability, is a vast and perpetual motive of credibility, and an irrefragable witness of its own Divine legation." [1] Its Divine Founder said, "I am the Light of the world;" and to His Apostles He said also, "Ye are the light of the world;" and of His Church He added, "A city seated on a hill cannot be hid." The Vatican Council says, "The Church is its own witness." My purpose is to draw out this assertion more fully.

These words affirm that the Church is self-evident, as light is to the eye, and, through sense, to the intellect. Next to the sun at noonday, there is nothing in the world more manifest than the one visible Universal Church. Both the faith and the infidelity of the world bear witness to it. It is loved and hated, trusted and feared, served and assaulted, honoured and blasphemed: it is Christ or Antichrist, the Kingdom of God or the imposture of Satan. It pervades the civilised world. No man and no nation can ignore it, none can be indifferent to it. Why is all this? How is its existence to be accounted for?

[1] *Const. Dogm. de Fide Catholica*, c. iii.

Let me suppose that I am an unbeliever in Christianity, and that some friend should make me promise to examine the evidence to show that Christianity is a Divine revelation. I should then sift and test the evidence as strictly as if I were in a court of law, and in a cause of life and death. My will would be in suspense: it would in no way control the process of my intellect. If it had any inclination from the equilibrium, it would be towards mercy and hope; but this would not add a feather's weight to the evidence, nor sway the intellect a hair's breadth.

After the examination has been completed, and my intellect convinced, the evidence being sufficient to prove that Christianity is a Divine revelation, nevertheless I am not yet a Christian. All this sifting brings me to the conclusion of a chain of reasoning; but I am not yet a believer. The last act of reason has brought me to the brink of the first act of faith. They are generically distinct and separable. The acts of reason are intellectual, and jealous of the interference of the will. The act of faith is an imperative act of the will, founded on and justified by the process and conviction of the intellect. Hitherto I have been a critic: henceforward, if I will, I become a disciple.

It may here be objected that no man can so far suspend the inclination of the will when the question is, has God indeed spoken to man or no? is the revealed law of purity, generosity, perfection, divine, or only the poetry of imagination? Can a man be indifferent between two such sides of the problem? Will he not

desire the higher and better side to be true? and if he desire, will he not incline to the side that he desires to find true? Can a moral being be absolutely indifferent between two such issues? and can two such issues be equally attractive to a moral agent? Can it be indifferent and all the same to us whether God has made Himself and His will known to us or not? Is there no attraction in light, no repulsion in darkness? Does not the intrinsic and eternal distinction of good and evil make itself felt in spite of the will? Are we not responsible to "receive the truth in the love of it"? Nevertheless, evidence has its own limits and quantities, and cannot be made more or less by any act of the will. And yet, what is good or bad, high or mean, lovely or hateful, ennobling or degrading, must attract or repel men as they are better or worse in their moral sense; for an equilibrium between good and evil, to God or to man is impossible.

The last act of my reason, then, is distinct from my first act of faith precisely in this: so long as I was uncertain I suspended the inclination of my will, as an act of fidelity to conscience and of loyalty to truth; but the process once complete, and the conviction once attained, my will imperatively constrains me to believe, and I become a disciple of a Divine revelation.

My friend next tells me that there are Christian Scriptures, and I go through precisely the same process of critical examination and final conviction, the last act of reasoning preceding, as before, the first act of faith.

He then tells me that there is a Church claiming

to be divinely founded, divinely guarded, and divinely guided in its custody of Christianity and of the Christian Scriptures.

Once more I have the same twofold process of reasoning and of believing to go through.

There is, however, this difference in the subject-matter: Christianity is an order of supernatural truth appealing intellectually to my reason; the Christian Scriptures are voiceless, and need a witness. They cannot prove their own mission, much less their own authenticity or inspiration. But the Church is visible to the eye, audible to the ear, self-manifesting and self-asserting: I cannot escape from it. If I go to the east, it is there; if I go to the west, it is there also. If I stay at home, it is before me, seated on the hill; if I turn away from it, I am surrounded by its light. It pursues me and calls to me. I cannot deny its existence; I cannot be indifferent to it: I must either listen to it or wilfully stop my ears; I must heed it or defy it, love it or hate it. But my first attitude towards it is to try it with forensic strictness, neither pronouncing it to be Christ nor Antichrist till I have tested its origin, claim, and character. Let us take down the case in short-hand.

1. It says that it interpenetrates all the nations of the civilised world. In some it holds the whole nation in its unity, in others it holds fewer; but in all it is present, visible, audible, naturalised, and known as the one Catholic Church, a name that none can appropriate. Though often claimed and controversially assumed, none can retain it: it falls off. The world knows only one

Catholic Church, and always restores the name to its right owner.

2. It is not a national body, but extra-national, accused of its foreign relations and foreign dependence. It is international, and independent in a supernational unity.

3. In faith, divine worship, sacred ceremonial, discipline, government, from the highest to the lowest, it is the same in every place.

4. It speaks all languages of the civilised world.

5. It is obedient to one Head, outside of all nations, except one only; and in that nation, his headship is not national but world-wide.

6. The world-wide sympathy of the Church in all lands with its Head has been manifested in our days, and before our eyes, by a series of public assemblages in Rome, of which nothing like or second to it can be found. In 1854, 350 Bishops of all nations surrounded their Head when he defined the Immaculate Conception. In 1862, 400 Bishops assembled at the canonisation of the Martyrs of Japan. In 1867, 500 Bishops came to keep the eighteenth centenary of St. Peter's martyrdom. In 1870, 700 Bishops assembled in the Vatican Council. On the Feast of the Epiphany, 1870, the Bishops of thirty nations during two whole hours made profession of faith in their own languages, kneeling before their Head. Add to this that in 1869, in the sacerdotal jubilee of Pius IX., Rome was filled for months by pilgrims from all lands in Europe and beyond the sea, from the Old World and from the New, bearing all manner of gifts and oblations to the Head of the Universal Church. To

this, again, must be added the world-wide outcry and protest of all the Catholic unity against the seizure and sacrilege of September 1870, when Rome was taken by the Italian Revolution.

7. All this came to pass not only by reason of the great love of the Catholic world for Pius IX., but because they revered him as the successor of S. Peter and the Vicar of Jesus Christ. For that undying reason the same events have been reproduced in the time of Leo XIII. In the early months of this year Rome was once more filled with pilgrims of all nations, coming in thousands as representatives of millions in all nations, to celebrate the sacerdotal jubilee of the Sovereign Pontiff. The courts of the Vatican could not find room for the multitude of gifts and offerings of every kind which were sent from all quarters of the world.

8. These things are here said, not because of any other importance, but because they set forth in the most visible and self-evident way the living unity and the luminous universality of the One Catholic and Roman Church.

9. What has thus far been said is before our eyes at this hour. It is no appeal to history, but to a visible and palpable fact. Men may explain it as they will; deny it, they cannot. They see the Head of the Church year by year speaking to the nations of the world; treating with Empires, Republics, and Governments. There is no other man on earth that can so bear himself. Neither from Canterbury nor from Constantinople can such a voice go forth to which rulers and people listen.

This is the century of revolutions. Rome has in our days been besieged three times; three Popes have been driven out of it, two have been shut up in the Vatican. The city is now full of the Revolution. The whole Church has been tormented by Falck laws, Mancini laws, and Crispi laws. An unbeliever in Germany said some years ago, "The net is now drawn so tight about the Church, that if it escapes this time I will believe in it." Whether he believes, or is even alive now to believe, I cannot say.

Nothing thus far has been said as proof. The visible palpable facts, which are at this moment before the eyes of all men, speak for themselves. There is one, and only one, world-wide unity of which these things can be said. It is a fact and a phenomenon for which an intelligible account must be rendered. If it be only a human system built up by the intellect, will, and energy of men, let the adversaries prove it. The burden is upon them; and they will have more to do as we go on.

Thus far we have rested upon the evidence of sense and fact. We must now go on to history and reason.

Every religion, and every religious body known to history, has varied from itself, and broken up. Brahminism has given birth to Buddhism; Mahometanism is parted into the Arabian and European Khalifates; the Greek schism into the Russian, Constantinopolitan, and Bulgarian autocephalous fragment; Protestantism into its multitudinous diversities. All have departed from their original type, and all are continually developing new and irreconcilable, intellectual and ritualistic,

diversities and repulsions. How is it that, with all diversities of language, civilisation, race, interest, and conditions, social and political, including persecution and warfare, the Catholic nations are at this day, even when in warfare, in unchanged unity of faith, communion, worship, and spiritual sympathy with each other and with their Head? This needs a rational explanation.

It may be said in answer, endless divisions have come out of the Church, from Arius to Photius, and from Photius to Luther. Yes, but they all came out. There is the difference. They did not remain in the Church, corrupting the faith. They came out, and ceased to belong to the Catholic unity, as a branch broken from a tree ceases to belong to the tree. But the identity of the tree remains the same. A branch is not a tree, nor a tree a branch. A tree may lose branches, but it rests upon its root, and renews its loss. Not so the religions, so to call them, that have broken away from unity. Not one has retained its members or its doctrines. Once separated from the sustaining unity of the Church, all separations lose their spiritual cohesion, and then their intellectual identity. *Ramus præcisus arescit.*

For the present it is enough to say that no human legislation, authority, or constraint can ever create internal unity of intellect and will; and that the diversities and contradictions generated by all human systems prove the absence of Divine authority. Variations or contradictions are proof of the absence of a Divine mission to mankind. All natural causes run t

disintegration. Therefore, they can render no account of the world-wide unity of the One Universal Church.

Such, then, are the facts before our eyes at this day. We will seek out the origin of the body or system called the Catholic Church, and pass at once to its outset eighteen hundred years ago.

I affirm, then, three things: (1) First, that no adequate account can be given of this undeniable fact from natural causes; (2) that the history of the Catholic Church demands causes above nature; and (3) that it has always claimed for itself a Divine origin and Divine authority.

I. And, first, before we examine what it was and what it has done, we will recall to mind what was the world in the midst of which it arose.

The most comprehensive and complete description of the old world, before Christianity came in upon it, is given in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Mankind had once the knowledge of God: that knowledge was obscured by the passions of sense; in the darkness of the human intellect, with the light of nature still before them, the nations worshipped the creature—that is, by pantheism, polytheism, idolatry; and, having lost the knowledge of God and of His perfections, they lost the knowledge of their own nature and of its laws: even of the natural and rational laws, which thenceforward ceased to guide, restrain, or govern them. They became perverted and inverted with every possible abuse, defeating the end and destroying the powers of creation. The lights of nature were put out, and the world rushed headlong into con-

fusions, of which the beasts that perish were innocent. This is analytically the history of all nations but one. A line of light still shone from Adam to Enoch, from Enoch to Abraham, to whom the command was given, "Walk before Me and be perfect." And it ran on from Abraham to Caiphas, who crucified the Founder of Christianity. Through all anthropomorphism of thought and language this line of light still passed inviolate and inviolable. But in the world, on either side of that radiant stream, the whole earth was dark. The intellectual and moral state of the Greek world may be measured in its highest excellence in Athens; and of the Roman world in Rome. The state of Athens —its private, domestic, and public morality—may be seen in Aristophanes.

The state of Rome is visible in Juvenal, and in the fourth book of S. Augustine's *City of God*. There was only one evil wanting. The world was not Atheist. Its polytheism was the example and the warrant of all forms of moral abominations. *Imitari quod colis* plunged the nations in crime. Their theology was their degradation; their text-book of an elaborate corruption of intellect and will.

Christianity came in "the fulness of time." What that fulness may mean is one of the mysteries of times and seasons which it is not for us to know. But one motive for the long delay of four thousand years is not far to seek. It gave time, full and ample, for the utmost development and consolidation of all the falsehood and evil of which the intellect and will of man are capable. The four great empires were each of them

the concentration of a supreme effort of human power. The second inherited from the first, the third from both, the fourth from all three. It was, as it was foretold or described, as a beast, "exceeding terrible; his teeth and claws were of iron; he devoured and broke in pieces; and the rest he stamped upon with his feet." [2] The empire of man over man was never so widespread, so absolute, so hardened into one organised mass, as in Imperial Rome. The world had never seen a military power so disciplined, irresistible, invincible; a legislation so just, so equitable, so strong in its execution; a government so universal, so local, so minute. It seemed to be imperishable. Rome was called the eternal. The religions of all nations were enshrined in Dea Roma; adopted, practised openly, and taught. They were all *religiones licitæ*, known to the law; not tolerated only, but recognised. The theologies of Egypt, Greece, and of the Latin world met in an empyreum, consecrated and guarded by the Imperial law, and administered by the Pontifex Maximus. No fanaticism ever surpassed the religious cruelties of Rome. Add to all this the colluvies of false philosophies of every land and of every date. They both blinded and hardened the intellect of public opinion and of private men against the invasion of anything except contempt and hatred of both the philosophy of sophists and of the religion of the people. Add to all this the sensuality of the most refined, and of the grossest luxury the world had ever seen, and a moral confusion and corruption which violated every law of nature.

[2] Daniel vii. 19.

The god of this world had built his city. From foundation to parapet, everything that the skill and power of man could do had been done without stint of means or limit of will. The Divine hand was stayed: or rather, as S. Augustine says, an unsurpassed natural greatness was the reward of certain natural virtues, degraded as they were in unnatural abominations. Rome was the climax of the power of man without God, the apotheosis of the human will, the direct and supreme antagonist of God in His own world. In this the fulness of time was come. Man built all this for himself. Certainly, man could not also build the City of God. They are not the work of one and the same architect, who capriciously chose to build first the city of confusion, suspending for a time his skill and power to build some day the City of God. Such a hypothesis is folly. Of two things, one. Disputers must choose one or the other. Both cannot be asserted, and the assertion needs no answer—it refutes itself. So much for the first point.

II. In the reign of Augustus, and in a remote and powerless Oriental race, a Child was born in a stable of a poor Mother. For thirty years He lived a hidden life; for three years He preached the Kingdom of God, and gave laws hitherto unknown to men. He died in ignominy upon the Cross; on the third day He rose again; and after forty days He was seen no more. This unknown Man created the world-wide unity of intellect and will which is visible to the eye, and audible, in all languages, to the ear. It is in harmony with the reason and moral nature of all nations, in all ages, to this day.

What proportion is there between the cause and the effect? What power was there in this isolated Man? What unseen virtues went out of Him to change the world? For change the world He did; and that not in the line or on the level of nature as men had corrupted it, but in direct contradiction to all that was then supreme in the world. He taught the dependence of the intellect against its self-trust, the submission of the will against its license, the subjugation of the passions by temperate control or by absolute subjection against their wilful indulgence. This was to reverse what men believed to be the laws of nature: to make water climb upward and fire to point downward. He taught mortification of the lusts of the flesh, contempt of the lusts of the eyes, and hatred of the pride of life. What hope was there that such a Teacher should convert Imperial Rome? that such a doctrine should exorcise the fulness of human pride and lust? Yet so it has come to pass; and how? Twelve men more obscure than Himself, absolutely without authority or influence of this world, preached throughout the Empire and beyond it. They asserted two facts: the one, that God had been made man; the other, that He died and rose again. What could be more incredible? To the Jews the unity and spirituality of God were axioms of reason and faith; to the Gentiles, however cultured, the resurrection of the flesh was impossible. The Divine Person Who had died and risen could not be called in evidence as the chief witness. He could not be produced in court. Could anything be more suspicious if credible, or less credible even if He were there to say so? All that they could

do was to say, "We knew Him for three years, both before His death and after He rose from the dead. If you will believe us, you will believe what we say. If you will not believe us, we can say no more. He is not here, but in heaven. We cannot call Him down." It is true, as we read, that Peter cured a lame man at the gate of the Temple. The Pharisees could not deny it, but they would not believe what Peter said; they only told him to hold his tongue. And yet thousands in one day in Jerusalem believed in the Incarnation and the Resurrection; and when the Apostles were scattered by persecution, wherever they went men believed their word. The most intense persecution was from the Jews, the people of faith and of Divine traditions. In the name of God and of religion they stoned Stephen, and sent Saul to persecute at Damascus. More than this, they stirred up the Romans in every place. As they had forced Pilate to crucify Jesus of Nazareth, so they swore to slay Paul. And yet, in spite of all, the faith spread.

It is true, indeed, that the Empire of Alexander, the spread of the Hellenistic Greek, the prevalence of Greek in Rome itself, the Roman roads which made the Empire traversable, the Roman peace which sheltered the preachers of the faith in the outset of their work, gave them facilities to travel and to be understood. But these were only external facilities, which in no way rendered more credible or more acceptable the voice of penance and mortification, or the mysteries of the faith, which was immutably "to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness." It was in changeless

opposition to nature as man had marred it; but it was in absolute harmony with nature as God had made it to His own likeness. Its power was its persuasiveness; and its persuasiveness was in its conformity to the highest and noblest aspirations and aims of the soul in man. The master-key so long lost was found at last; and its conformity to the wards of the lock was its irrefragable witness to its own mission and message.

But if it is beyond belief that Christianity in its outset made good its foothold by merely human causes and powers, how much more does this become incredible in every age as we come down from the first century to the nineteenth, and from the Apostolic mission to the world-wide Church, Catholic and Roman, at this day.

Not only did the world in the fulness of its power give to the Christian faith no help to root or to spread itself, but it wreaked all the fulness of its power upon it to uproot and to destroy it. Of the first thirty Pontiffs in Rome, twenty-nine were martyred. Ten successive persecutions, or rather one universal and continuous persecution of two hundred years, with ten more bitter outbreaks of enmity in every province of the Empire, did all that man can do to extinguish the Christian name. The Christian name may be blotted out here and there in blood, but the Christian faith can nowhere be slain. It is inscrutable, and beyond the reach of man. In nothing is the blood of the martyrs more surely the seed of the faith. Every martyrdom was a witness to the faith, and the ten persecutions were the sealing of the work of the twelve

Apostles. The destroyer defeated himself. Christ crucified was visibly set forth before all the nations, the world was a Calvary, and the blood of the martyrs preached in every tongue the Passion of Jesus Christ. The world did its worst, and ceased only for weariness and conscious defeat.

Then came the peace, and with peace the peril of the Church. The world outside had failed: the world inside began to work. It no longer destroyed life; it perverted the intellect, and, through intellectual perversion, assailed the faith at its centre. The Angel of light preached heresy. The Baptismal Creed was assailed all along the line: Gnosticism assailed the Father and Creator of all things; Arianism, the Godhead of the Son; Nestorianism, the unity of His Person; Monophysites, the two natures; Monothelites, the Divine and human wills; Macedonians, the Person of the Holy Ghost. So throughout the centuries, from Nicæa to the Vatican, every article has been in succession perverted by heresy and defined by the Church. But of this we shall speak hereafter. If the human intellect could fasten its perversions on the Christian faith, it would have done so long ago; and if the Christian faith had been guarded by no more than the human intellect, it would long ago have been disintegrated, as we see in every religion outside the unity of the One Catholic Church. There is no example in which fragmentary Christianities have not departed from their original type. No human system is immutable; no thing human is changeless. The human intellect, therefore, can give no sufficient account of the identity

of the Catholic faith in all places and in all ages by any of its own natural processes or powers. The force of this argument is immensely increased when we trace the tradition of the faith through the nineteen Œcumenical Councils which, with one continuous intelligence, have guarded and unfolded the deposit of faith, defining every truth as it has been successively assailed, in absolute harmony and unity of progression.

What the Senate is to your great Republic, or the Parliament to our English monarchy, such are the nineteen Councils of the Church, with this only difference: the secular Legislatures must meet year by year with short recesses; Councils have met on the average once in a century. The reason of this is that the mutabilities of national life, which are as the waterfloods, need constant remedies; the stability of the Church seldom needs new legislation. The faith needs no definition except in rare intervals of periodical intellectual disorder. The discipline of the Church reigns by an universal common law which seldom needs a change, and by local laws which are provided on the spot. Nevertheless, the legislation of the Church, the *Corpus Juris*, or *Canon Law*, is a creation of wisdom and justice, to which no Statutes at large or Imperial pandects can bear comparison. Human intellect has reached its climax in jurisprudence, but the world-wide and secular legislation of the Church has a higher character. How the Christian law corrected, elevated, and completed the Imperial law may be seen in a learned and able work by an American author, far from the Catholic faith, but in the main just and

accurate in his facts and arguments—the *Gesta Christi* of Charles Loring Brace. Water cannot rise above its source, and if the Church by mere human wisdom corrected and perfected the Imperial law, its source must be higher than the sources of the world. This makes a heavy demand on our credulity.

Starting from S. Peter to Leo XIII., there have been some 258 Pontiffs claiming to be, and recognised by the whole Catholic unity as, successors of S. Peter and Vicars of Jesus Christ. To them has been rendered in every age not only the external obedience of outward submission, but the internal obedience of faith. They have borne the onset of the nations who destroyed Imperial Rome, and the tyranny of heretical Emperors of Byzantium: and, worse than this, the alternate despotism and patronage of Emperors of the West, and the subtraction of obedience in the great Western schism, when the unity of the Church and the authority of its Head were, as men thought, gone for ever. It was the last assault—the forlorn hope of the gates of hell. Every art of destruction had been tried: martyrdom, heresy, secularity, schism; at last, two, and three, and four claimants, or, as the world says, rival Popes, were set up, that men might believe that S. Peter had no longer a successor, and our Lord no Vicar, upon earth; for, though all might be illegitimate, only one could be the lawful and true Head of the Church. Was it only by the human power of man that the unity, external and internal, which for fourteen hundred years had been supreme, was once more restored in the Council of Constance, never to be broken again? The suc-

cession of the English monarchy has been, indeed, often broken, and always restored, in these thousand years. But here is a monarchy of eighteen hundred years, powerless in worldly force or support, claiming and receiving not only outward allegiance, but inward unity of intellect and will. If any man tell us that these two phenomena are on the same level of merely human causes, it is too severe a tax upon our natural reason to believe it.

But the inadequacy of human causes to account for the universality, unity, and immutability of the Catholic Church, will stand out more visibly if we look at the intellectual and moral revelation which Christianity has wrought in the world and upon mankind.

The first effect of Christianity was to fill the world with the true knowledge of the One True God, and to destroy utterly all idols, not by fire, but by light. Before the Light of the world no false god and no polytheism could stand. The unity and spirituality of God swept away all theogonies and theologies of the first four thousand years. The stream of light which descended from the beginning expanded into a radiance, and the radiance into a flood, which illuminated all nations, as it had been foretold, "The earth is filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the covering waters of the sea;" "And idols shall be utterly destroyed."[3] In this true knowledge of the Divine Nature was revealed to men their own relation to a Creator as of sons to a father. The Greeks called the chief of the gods *Zeus Pater*, and the Latins *Jupiter;* but neither realised

[3] Isaias xi. 9-11, 18.

the dependence and love of sonship as revealed by the Founder of Christianity.

The monotheism of the world comes down from a primeval and Divine source. Polytheism is the corruption of men and of nations. Yet in the multiplicity of all polytheisms, one supreme Deity was always recognised. The Divine unity was imperishable. Polytheism is of human imagination: it is of men's manufacture. The deification of nature and passions and heroes had filled the world with an elaborate and tenacious superstition, surrounded by reverence, fear, religion, and awe. Every perversion of what is good in man surrounded it with authority; everything that is evil in man guarded it with jealous care. Against this world-wide and imperious demonology the science of one God, all holy and supreme, advanced with resistless force. Beelzebub is not divided against himself; and if polytheism is not Divine, monotheism must be. The overthrow of idolatry and demonology was the mastery of forces that are above nature. This conclusion is enough for our present purpose.

A second visible effect of Christianity of which nature cannot offer any adequate cause is to be found in the domestic life of the Christian world. In some nations the existence of marriage was not so much as recognised. In others, if recognised, it was dishonoured by profuse concubinage. Even in Israel, the most advanced nation, the law of divorce was permitted for the hardness of their hearts. Christianity republished the primitive law by which marriage unites only one man and one woman indissolubly in a perpetual

contract. It raised their mutual and perpetual contract to a sacrament. This at one blow condemned all other relations between man and woman, all the legal gradations of the Imperial law, and all forms and pleas of divorce. Beyond this the spiritual legislation of the Church framed most elaborate tables of consanguinity and affinity, prohibiting all marriages between persons in certain degrees of kinship or relation. This law has created the purity and peace of domestic life. Neither the Greek nor the Roman world had any true conception of a home. The Ἑστία, or Vesta, was a sacred tradition guarded by vestals like a temple worship. It was not a law and a power in the homes of the people. Christianity, by enlarging the circles of prohibition within which men and women were as brothers and sisters, has created the home with all its purities and safeguards.

Such a law of unity and indissolubility, encompassed by a multitude of prohibitions, no mere human legislation could impose on the passions and will of mankind. And yet the Imperial laws gradually yielded to its resistless pressure, and incorporated it in its world-wide legislation. The passions and practices of four thousand years were against the change ; yet it was accomplished, and it reigns inviolate to this day, though the relaxations of schism in the East and the laxities of the West have revived the abuse of divorces, and have partially abolished the wise and salutary prohibitions which guard the homes of the faithful. These relaxations prove that all natural forces have been, and are, hostile to the indissoluble law of Christian marriage. Certainly,

then, it was not by natural forces that the Sacrament of Matrimony and the legislation springing from it were enacted. If these are restraints of human liberty and license, either they do not spring from nature, or they have had a supernatural cause whereby they exist. It was this that redeemed woman from the traditional degradation in which the world had held her. The condition of women in Athens and in Rome—which may be taken as the highest points of civilisation—is too well known to need recital. Women had no rights, no property, no independence. Plato looked upon them as State property; Aristotle as chattels; the Greeks wrote of them as *κύνες, γυναῖκες, καὶ τὰ ἀλλὰ κτήματα*. They were the prey, the sport, the slaves of man. Even in Israel, though they were raised incomparably higher than in the Gentile world, they were far below the dignity and authority of Christian women. Libanius, the friend of Julian the Apostate, said, "O ye gods of Greece, how great are the women of the Christians!" Whence came the elevation of womanhood? Not from the ancient civilisation, for it degraded them; not from Israel, for among the Jews the highest state of womanhood was the marriage state. The daughter of Jepthe went into the mountains to mourn not her death but her virginity. The marriage state in the Christian world, though holy and good, is not the highest state. The state of virginity unto death is the highest condition of man and woman. But this is above the law of nature. It belongs to a higher order. And this life of virginity, in repression of natural passion and lawful instinct, is both above and against the ten-

dencies of human nature. It begins in a mortification, and ends in a mastery, over the movements and ordinary laws of human nature. Who will ascribe this to natural causes? and, if so, why did it not appear in the first four thousand years? And when has it ever appeared except in a handful of vestal virgins, or in Oriental recluses, with what reality history shows? An exception proves a rule. No one will imagine that a life of chastity is impossible to nature; but the restriction is a repression of nature which individuals may acquire, but the multitude have never attained. A religion which imposes chastity on the unmarried, and upon its priesthood, and upon the multitudes of women in every age who devote themselves to the service of One Whom they have never seen, is a mortification of nature in so high a degree as to stand out as a fact and a phenomenon, of which mere natural causes afford no adequate solution. Its existence, not in a handful out of the millions of the world, but its prevalence and continuity in multitudes scattered throughout the Christian world, proves the presence of a cause higher than the laws of nature. So true is this, that jurists teach that the three vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience are contrary to "the policy of the law," that is, to the interests of the commonwealth, which desires the multiplication, enrichment, and liberty of its members.

To what has been said may be added the change wrought by Christianity upon the social, political, and international relations of the world. The root of this ethical change, private and public, is the Christian

home. The authority of parents, the obedience of children, the love of brotherhood, are the three active powers which have raised the society of man above the level of the old world. Israel was head and shoulders above the world around it; but Christendom is high above Israel. The New Commandment of brotherly love, and the Sermon on the Mount, have wrought a revolution, both in private and public life. From this come the laws of justice and sympathy which bind together the nations of the Christian world. In the old world, even the most refined races, worshipped by our modern philosophers, held and taught that man could hold property in man. In its chief cities there were more slaves than free men. Who has taught the equality of men before the law, and extinguished the impious thought that man can hold property in man? It was no philosopher: even Aristotle taught that a slave was ὄργανον ζῶον. It was no lawgiver, for all taught the lawfulness of slavery till Christianity denied it. The Christian law has taught that man can lawfully sell his labour, but that he cannot lawfully be sold, or sell himself.

The necessity of being brief, the impossibility of drawing out the picture of the old world, its profound immoralities, its unimaginable cruelties, compels me to argue with my right hand tied behind me. I can do no more than point again to Mr. Brace's *Gesta Christi*, or to Dr. Döllinger's *Gentile and Jew*, as witnesses to the facts which I have stated or implied. No one who has not read such books, or mastered their contents by original study, can judge of the force of the assertion

that Christianity has reformed the world by direct antagonism to the human will, and by a searching and firm repression of human passion. It has ascended the stream of human license, *contra ictum fluminis*, by a power mightier than nature, and by laws of a higher order than the downward stream of this world.

Before Christianity came on earth, the civilisation of man by merely natural force had culminated. It could not rise above its source; all that it could do was done; and the civilisation in every race and empire had ended in decline and corruption. The old civilisation was not regenerated. It passed away, to give place to a new. But the new had a higher source, nobler laws, and supernatural powers. The highest excellence of men and of nations is the civilisation of Christianity. The human race has ascended into what we call Christendom, that is, into the new creation of charity and justice among men. Christendom was created by the world-wide Church as we see it before our eyes at this day. Philosophers and statesmen believe it to be the work of their own hands: they did not make it; but they have for three hundred years been unmaking it by reformations and revolutions. These are destructive forces. They build up nothing. It has been well said by Donoso Cortez that "the history of civilisation is the history of Christianity, the history of Christianity is the history of the Church, the history of the Church is the history of the Pontiffs, the greatest statesmen and rulers that the world has ever seen."

Some years ago, a Professor of great literary reputation in England, who was supposed even then to be,

as his subsequent writings have proved, a sceptic or non-Christian, published a well-known and very candid book, under the title of *Ecce Homo*. The writer placed himself, as it were, outside of Christianity. He took, not the Church in the world as in this article, but the Christian Scriptures as a historical record, to be judged with forensic severity and absolute impartiality of mind. To the credit of the author, he fulfilled this pledge; and his conclusion shall here be given. After an examination of the life and character of the Author of Christianity, he proceeded to estimate His teaching and its effects under the following heads:

1. The Christian Legislation.
2. The Christian Republic.
3. Its Universality.
4. The Enthusiasm of Humanity.
5. The Lord's Supper.
6. Positive Morality.
7. Philanthropy.
8. Edification.
9. Mercy.
10. Resentment.
11. Forgiveness.

He then draws his conclusion as follows:

"The achievement of Christ in founding by His single will and power a structure so durable and so universal is like no other achievement which history records. The masterpieces of the men of action are coarse and commonplace in comparison with it, and the masterpieces of speculation flimsy and unsubstantial. When we speak of it the commonplaces of admiration fail us altogether. Shall we speak of the originality of the design, of the skill displayed in the execution? All such terms are inadequate. Originality and contriving skill operate

indeed, but, as it were, implicitly. The creative effort which produced that against which it is said the gates of hell shall not prevail cannot be analysed. No architect's designs were furnished for the New Jerusalem; no committee drew up rules for the universal commonwealth. If in the works of nature we can trace the indications of calculation, of a struggle with difficulties, of precaution, of ingenuity, then in Christ's work it may be that the same indications occur. But these inferior and secondary powers were not consciously exercised; they were implicitly present in the manifold yet single creative act. The inconceivable work was done in calmness; before the eyes of men it was noiselessly accomplished, attracting little attention. Who can describe that which unites men? Who has entered into the formation of speech, which is the symbol of their union? Who can describe exhaustively the origin of civil society? He who can do these things can explain the origin of the Christian Church. For others it must be enough to say, 'The Holy Ghost fell on those that believed.' No man saw the building of the New Jerusalem, the workmen crowded together, the unfinished walls and unpaved streets; no man heard the clink of trowel and pickaxe: 'it descended out of heaven from God.'"[4]

And yet the writer is, as he was then, still outside of Christianity.

III. We come now to our third point, that Christianity has always claimed a Divine origin and a Divine presence as the source of its authority and powers.

To prove this by texts from the New Testament would be to transcribe the volume; and if the evidence of the whole New Testament were put in, not only might some men deny its weight as evidence, but we should place our whole argument upon a false foundation. Christianity was anterior to the New Testament, and is independent of it. The Christian Scriptures presuppose both the faith and the Church as already existing, known, and believed. *Prior liber quam stylus:*

[4] *Ecce Homo*, Conclusion, p. 329, 5th Edition, Macmillan, 1886.

as Tertullian argued. The Gospel was preached before it was written. The four books were written to those who already believed, to confirm their faith. They were written at intervals: S. Matthew in Hebrew in the year 39, in Greek in 45. S. Mark in 43, S. Luke in 57. S. John about 90, in different places and for different motives. Four Gospels did not exist for sixty years, or two generations of men. S. Peter and S. Paul knew of only three of our four. In those sixty years the faith had spread from east to west. Saints and Martyrs had gone up to their crown who never saw a sacred book. The Apostolic Epistles prove the antecedent existence of the Churches to which they were addressed. Rome and Corinth, and Galatia and Ephesus, Philippi and Colossæ were Churches with pastors and people before S. Paul wrote to them. The Church had already attested and executed its Divine legation before the New Testament existed; and when all its books were written they were not as yet collected into a volume. The earliest collection was about the beginning of the second century, and in the custody of the Church in Rome. We must, therefore, seek to know what was and is Christianity before and outside of the written books; and we have the same evidence for the oral tradition of the faith as we have for the New Testament itself. Both alike were in the custody of the Church; both are delivered to us by the same witness and on the same evidence. To reject either is logically to reject both. Happily men are not saved by logic, but by faith. The millions of men in all ages have believed by inherit-

ance of truth divinely guarded and delivered to them. They have no need of logical analysis. They have believed from their childhood. Neither children nor those who *infantibus æquiparantur* are logicians. It is the penance of the doubter and the unbeliever to regain by toil his lost inheritance. It is a hard penance, like the suffering of those who eternally debate on "predestination, freewill, fate."

Between the death of S. John and the mature lifetime of S. Irenæus fifty years elapsed. S. Polycarp was disciple of S. John, S. Irenæus was disciple of S. Polycarp. The mind of S. John and the mind of S. Irenæus had only one intermediate intelligence, in contact with each. It would be an affectation of minute criticism to treat the doctrine of S. Irenæus as a departure from the doctrine of S. Polycarp, or the doctrine of S. Polycarp as a departure from the doctrine of S. John. Moreover, S. John ruled the Church at Ephesus, and S. Irenæus was born in Asia Minor about the year A.D. 120—that is, twenty years after S. John's death, when the Church in Asia Minor was still full of the light of his teaching and of the accents of his voice. Let us see how S. Irenæus describes the faith and the Church. In his work against Heresies, in Book iii. chap. i., he says: "We have known the way of our salvation by those through whom the Gospel came to us; which, indeed, they then preached, but afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us in Scriptures, the future foundation and pillar of our faith. It is not lawful to say that they preached ore they had perfect knowledge, as some dare to

affirm, boasting themselves to be correctors of the Apostles. For after our Lord rose from the dead, and when they had been clothed with the power of the Holy Ghost, Who came upon them from on high, they were filled with all truths, and had knowledge which was perfect." In chapter ii. he adds that, "When they are refuted out of Scripture, they turn and accuse the Scriptures as erroneous, unauthoritative, and of various readings, so that the truth cannot be found by those who do not know tradition"—that is, their own. "But when we challenge them to come to the tradition of the Apostles, which is in custody of the succession of Presbyters in the Church, they turn against tradition, saying that they are not only wiser than the Presbyters, but even the Apostles, and have found the truth." "It therefore comes to pass that they will not agree either with the Scriptures or with tradition." (Ibid. c. iii.) "Therefore, all who desire to know the truth ought to look to the tradition of the Apostles, which is manifest in all the world and in all the Church. We are able to count up the Bishops who were instituted in the Church by the Apostles, and their successors to our day. They never taught nor knew such things as these men madly assert." "But as it would be too long in such a book as this to enumerate the successions of all the Churches, we point to the tradition of the greatest, most ancient Church, known to all, founded and constituted in Rome by the two glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, and to the faith announced to all men, coming down to us by the succession of Bishops, thereby confounding all those who,

in any way, by self-pleasing, or vainglory, or blindness, or an evil mind, teach as they ought not. For with this Church, by reason of its greater principality, it is necessary that all Churches should agree; that is, the faithful, wheresoever they be, for in that Church the tradition of the Apostles has been preserved." No comment need be made on the words the "greater principality," which have been perverted by every anti-Catholic writer from the time they were written to this day. But if any one will compare them with the words of S. Paul to the Colossians (chap. i. 18), describing the primacy of the Head of the Church in heaven, it will appear almost certain that the original Greek of S. Irenæus, which is unfortunately lost, contained either τὰ πρωτεῖα, or some inflexion of πρωτεύω, which signifies primacy. However this may be, S. Irenæus goes on: "The blessed Apostles, having founded and instructed the Church, gave in charge the Episcopate, for the administration of the same, to Linus. Of this Linus, Paul, in his Epistle to Timothy, makes mention. To him succeeded Anacletus, and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement received the Episcopate, he who saw the Apostles themselves and conferred with them, while as yet he had the preaching of the Apostles in his ears and the tradition before his eyes; and not he only, but many who had been taught by the Apostles still survived. In the time of this Clement, when no little dissension had arisen among the brethren in Corinth, the Church in Rome wrote very powerful letters *potentissimas litteras* to the Corinthians, recalling them to peace, restoring their

faith, and declaring the tradition which it had so short a time ago received from the Apostles." These letters of S. Clement are well known, but have lately become more valuable and complete by the discovery of fragments published in a new edition by Lightfoot. In these fragments there is a tone of authority fully explaining the words of S. Irenæus. He then traces the succession of the Bishops of Rome to his own day, and adds: "This demonstration is complete to show that it is one and the same life-giving faith which has been preserved in the Church from the Apostles until now, and is handed on in truth." "Polycarp was not only taught by the Apostles, and conversed with many of those who had seen our Lord, but he also was constituted by the Apostles in Asia to be Bishop in the Church of Smyrna. We also saw him in our early youth, for he lived long, and when very old departed from this life most gloriously and nobly by martyrdom. He ever taught that what he had learned from the Apostles, and what the Church had delivered, those things only are true." In the fourth chapter, S. Irenæus goes on to say: "Since, then, there are such proofs (of the faith), the truth is no longer to be sought for among others, which it is easy to receive from the Church, forasmuch as the Apostles laid up all truth in fulness in a rich depository, that all who will may receive from it the water of life." "But what if the Apostles had not left us the Scriptures: ought we not to follow the order of tradition, which they gave in charge to them to whom they intrusted the Churches? To which order (of tradition) many barbarous nations

yield assent, who believe in Christ without paper and ink, having salvation written by the Spirit in their hearts, and diligently holding the ancient tradition." In the twenty-sixth chapter of the same book he says: "Therefore, it is our duty to obey the Presbyters who are in the Church, who have succession from the Apostles, as we have already shown; who also with the succession of the Episcopate have the *charisma veritatis certum*," the spiritual and certain gift of truth.

I have quoted these passages at length, not so much as proofs of the Catholic Faith as to show the identity of the Church at its outset with the Church before our eyes at this hour, proving that the acorn has grown up into its oak, or, if you will, the identity of the Church at this hour with the Church of the Apostolic mission. These passages show the Episcopate, its central principality, its succession, its custody of the faith, its subsequent reception and guardianship of the Scriptures, its Divine tradition, and the *charisma* or Divine assistance by which its perpetuity is secured in the succession of the Apostles. This is almost verbally, after eighteen hundred years, the decree of the Vatican Council: *Veritatis et fidei nunquam deficientis charisma.*[5]

But S. Irenæus draws out in full the Church of this day. He shows the parallel of the first creation and of the second; of the first Adam and the Second; and of the analogy between the Incarnation or natural body, and the Church or mystical body of Christ. He says:

[5] *Const. Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesia Christi*, cap. iv.

Our faith "we received from the Church, and guard . . . . as an excellent gift in a noble vessel, always full of youth, and making youthful the vessel itself in which it is. For this gift of God is intrusted to the Church, as the breath of life (*was imparted*) to the first man, to this end, that all the members partaking of it might be quickened with life. And thus the communication of Christ is imparted—that is, the Holy Ghost, the earnest of incorruption, the confirmation of the faith, the way of ascent to God. For in the Church (S. Paul says) God placed Apostles, Prophets, Doctors, and all other operations of the Spirit, of which none are partakers who do not come to the Church, thereby depriving themselves of life by a perverse mind and worse deeds. For where the Church is, there is also the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and all grace. But the Spirit is truth. Wherefore, they who do not partake of Him (*the Spirit*), and are not nurtured unto life at the breast of the mother (*the Church*), do not receive of that most pure fountain which proceeds from the Body of Christ, but dig out for themselves broken pools from the trenches of the earth, and drink water soiled with mire, because they turn aside from the faith of the Church lest they should be convicted, and reject the Spirit lest they should be taught." [6]

Again he says:

"The Church, scattered throughout all the world, even unto the ends of the earth, received from the Apostles and their disciples the faith in one God the

[6] S. Irenæus, *Cont. Hæret.*, lib. iii. cap. xxiv.

Father Almighty, that made the heaven and the earth, and the seas, and all things that are in them," &c.[7]

He then recites the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and His coming again to raise all men, to judge men and angels, and to give sentence of condemnation or of life everlasting. How much soever the language may vary from other forms, such is the substance of the Baptismal Creed. He then adds:

"The Church having received this preaching and this faith, as we have said before, although it be scattered abroad through the whole world, carefully preserves it, dwelling as in one habitation, and believes alike in these (doctrines) as though she had one soul and the same heart: and in strict accord, as though she had one mouth, proclaims, and teaches, and delivers onward these things. And although there be many diverse languages in the world, yet the power of the tradition is one and the same. And neither do the Churches planted in Germany believe otherwise, or otherwise deliver (the faith), nor those in Iberia, nor among the Celtæ, nor in the East, nor in Egypt, nor in Libya, nor they that are planted in the mainland. But as the sun, which is God's creature, in all the world is one and the same, so also the preaching of the truth shineth everwhere, and lighteneth all men that are willing to come to the knowledge of the truth. And neither will any ruler of the Church, though he be mighty in the utterance of truth, teach otherwise than

[7] Lib. i. cap. x.

thus (for no man is above the master), nor will he that is weak in the same diminish from the tradition; for the faith being one and the same, he that is able to say most of it hath nothing over, and he that is able to say least hath no lack." [8]

To S. Irenæus, then, the Church was "the irrefragable witness of its own legation." When did it cease so to be? It would be easy to multiply quotations from Tertullian in A.D. 200, from S. Cyprian A.D. 250, from S. Augustine and S. Optatus in A.D. 350, from S. Leo in A.D. 450, all of which are on the same traditional lines of faith in a Divine mission to the world and of a Divine assistance in its discharge. But I refrain from doing so because I should have to write not an article but a folio. Any Catholic Theology will give the passages which are now before me; or one such book as the *Loci Theologici* of Melchior Canus will suffice to show the continuity and identity of the tradition of S. Irenæus and the tradition of the Vatican Council, in which the universal Church last declared the immutable faith and its own legation to mankind.

The world-wide testimony of the Catholic Church is a sufficient witness to prove the coming of the Incarnate Son to redeem mankind, and to return to His Father; it is also sufficient to prove the advent of the Holy Ghost to abide with us for ever. The work of the Son in this world was accomplished by the Divine acts and facts of His three-and-thirty years of life, death, Resurrection, and Ascension. The office of the Holy Ghost is perpetual not only as the Illuminator

[8] S. Irenæus, lib. i. c. x.

and Sanctifier of all who believe, but also as the Life and Guide of the Church. I may quote now the words of the Founder of the Church : "It is expedient to you that I go : for if I go not, the Paraclete will not come to you ; but if I go, I will send Him to you." [9] "I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever."[10] "The Spirit of Truth, Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not nor knoweth Him ; but you shall know Him, because He shall abide with you and shall be in you."[11] S. Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians describes the Church as a body of which the Head is in heaven, and the Author of its indefectible life abiding in it as in His temple. Therefore the words, "He that heareth you heareth Me." This could not be if the witness of the Apostles had been only human. A Divine guidance was attached to the office they bore. They were therefore also judges of right and wrong, and teachers by Divine guidance of the truth. But the presence and guidance of the Spirit of Truth is as full at this day as when S. Irenæus wrote. As the Churches then were witnesses, judges, and teachers, so is the Church at this hour a world-wide witness, an unerring judge and teacher, divinely guided and guarded in the truth. It is therefore not only a human and historical witness, but a Divine. This is the chief Divine truth which the last three hundred years have obscured. Modern Christianity believes in the one advent of the Redeemer, but rejects the full and personal advent of the Holy

[9] S. John xvi. 7. [10] Ibid. xiv. 16. [11] Ibid. xiv. 16, 17

Ghost. And yet the same evidence proves both. The Christianity of reformers always returns to Judaism, because they reject the full, or do not believe the personal, advent of the Holy Ghost. They deny that there is any infallible teacher among men; and therefore they return to the types and shadows of the Law before the Incarnation, when the Head was not yet incarnate, and the Body of Christ did not as yet exist.

But perhaps some one will say, "I admit your description of the Church as it is now, and as it was in the days of S. Irenæus; but the eighteen hundred years of which you have said nothing were ages of declension, disorder, superstition, demoralisation." I will answer by a question: Was not this foretold? Was not the Church to be a field of wheat and tares growing together till the harvest at the end of the world? There were Cathari of old and Puritans since, impatient at the patience of God in bearing with the perversities and corruptions of the human intellect and will. The Church, like its Head in heaven, is both human and Divine. "He was crucified in weakness," but no power of man could wound His Divine nature. So with the Church, which is His Body. Its human element may corrupt and die; its Divine life, sanctity, authority, and structure cannot die: nor can the errors of the human intellect fasten upon its faith, nor the immoralities of the human will fasten upon its sanctity. Its organisation of Head and Body is of Divine creation, divinely guarded by the Holy Ghost, Who quickens it by His indwelling and guides it by His light. It is in itself incorrupt and incorruptible

in the midst of corruption, as the light of heaven falls upon all the decay and corruption of the world, unsullied and unalterably pure. We are never concerned to deny or to cloak the sins of Christians or of Catholics. They may destroy themselves, but they cannot infect the Church from which they fall. The fall of Lucifer left no stain behind him.

When men accuse the Church of corruption, they reveal the fact that to them the Church is a human institution, of voluntary aggregation or of legislative enactment. They reveal the fact that to them the Church is not an object of Divine faith, as the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar. They do not perceive or will not believe that the articles of the Baptismal Creed are objects of faith, divinely revealed or divinely created. "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins," are all objects of faith in a Divine order. They are present in human history, but the human element which envelops them has no power to infect or to fasten upon them. Until this is perceived there can be no true or full belief in the advent and office of the Holy Ghost, or in the nature and sacramental action of the Church. It is the visible means and pledge of light and of sanctification to all who do not bar their intellect and their will against its inward and spiritual grace. The Church is not on probation. It is the instrument of probation to the world. As the light of the world, it is changeless as the firmament. As the source of sanctification, it is inexhaustible as the River of Life. The human and external history of

men calling themselves Christian and Catholic has been at times as degrading and abominable as any adversary is pleased to say. But the sanctity of the Church is no more affected by human sins than was Baptism by the hypocrisy of Simon Magus. The Divine foundation, and office, and mission of the Church is a part of Christianity. They who deny it deny an article of faith; they who believe it imperfectly are the followers of a fragmentary Christianity of modern date. Who can be a disciple of Jesus Christ who does not believe the words? "On this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you;" [12] "I dispose to you, as My Father hath disposed to Me, a kingdom;" [13] "All power in heaven and earth is given unto Me. Go, therefore, and teach all nations;" [14] "He that heareth you heareth Me;" [15] "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world;" [16] "When the days of Pentecost were accomplished they were all together in one place: and suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a mighty wind coming, and there appeared to them parted tongues, as it were, of fire;" "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost;" [17] "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no other burdens." [18] But who denies that the Apostles claimed a Divine mission? and who can deny that the Catholic and Roman Church from S. Irenæus to Leo XIII. has ever and openly claimed the same, invoking in all its

[12] S. John xx. 21.
[13] S. Luke xxii. 29.
[14] S. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19.
[15] S. Luke x. 10.
[16] S. Matt. xxvii. 20.
[17] Acts ii. 1-5.
[18] Ibid. xv. 28.

supreme acts as witness, teacher, and legislator the presence, light, and guidance of the Holy Ghost? As the preservation of all created things is by the same creative power produced in perpetual and universal action, so the indefectibility of the Church and of the faith is by the perpetuity of the presence and office of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. Therefore, S. Augustine calls the day of Pentecost, *Natalis Spiritus Sancti.*

It is more than time that I should make an end; and to do so it will be well to sum up the heads of our argument. The Vatican Council declares that the world-wide Church is the irrefragable witness of its own legation or mission to mankind.

In proof of this I have affirmed:

1. That the imperishable existence of Christianity, and the vast and undeniable revolution that it has wrought in men and in nations, in the moral elevation of manhood and of womanhood, and in the domestic, social, and political life of the Christian world, cannot be accounted for by any natural causes, or by any forces that are, as philosophers say, *intra possibilitatem naturæ*, within the limits of what is possible to man.

2. That this world-wide and permanent elevation of the Christian world, in comparison with both the old world and the modern world outside of Christianity, demands a cause higher than the possibility of nature.

3. That the Church has always claimed a Divine origin and a Divine office and authority in virtue of a perpetual Divine assistance. To this even the Christian world, in all its fragments external to the Catholic unity,

bears witness. It is turned to our reproach. They rebuke us for holding the teaching of the Church to be infallible. We take the rebuke as a testimony of our changeless faith. It is not enough for men to say that they refuse to believe this account of the visible and palpable fact of the imperishable Christianity of the Catholic and Roman Church. They must find a more reasonable, credible, and adequate account for it. This no man has yet done. The denials are many and the solutions are many; but they do not agree together. Their multiplicity is proof of their human origin. The claim of the Catholic Church to a Divine authority and to a Divine assistance is one and the same in every age, and is identical in every place. Error is not the principle of unity, nor truth of variations.

The Church has guarded the doctrine of the Apostles, by Divine assistance, with unerring fidelity. The articles of the faith are to-day the same in number as in the beginning. The explicit definition of their implicit meaning has expanded from age to age, as the ever-changing denials and perversions of the world have demanded new definitions of the ancient truth. The world is against all dogma, because it is impatient of definiteness and certainty in faith. It loves open questions and the liberty of error. The Church is dogmatic for fear of error. Every truth defined adds to its treasure. It narrows the field of error and enlarges the inheritance of truth. The world and the Church are ever moving in opposite directions. As the world becomes more vague and uncertain, the Church becomes more definite. It moves against wind and tide,

against the stress and storm of the world. There was never a more luminous evidence of this supernatural fact than in the Vatican Council. For eight months all that the world could say and do, like the four winds of heaven, was directed upon it. Governments, statesmen, diplomatists, philosophers, intriguers, mockers, and traitors did their utmost and their worst against it. They were in dread lest the Church should declare that by Divine assistance its Head in faith and morals cannot err; for if this be true, man did not found it, man cannot reform it, man cannot teach it to interpret its history or its acts. It knows its own history, and is the supreme witness of its own legation.

I am well aware that I have been writing truisms, and repeating trite and trivial arguments. They are trite because the feet of the faithful for nearly nineteen hundred years have worn them in their daily life: they are trivial because they point to the one path in which the wayfarer, though a fool, shall not err.

THE END.

WORKS BY

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL MANNING.

BLESSED SACRAMENT THE CENTRE OF IMMUTABLE TRUTH. Second edition. Cloth, 1*s.*

CONFIDENCE IN GOD. Fourth edition. 1*s.*

ENGLAND AND CHRISTENDOM. 10*s.* 6*d.*

FOURFOLD SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD. Third edition. 2*s.* 6*d.*; cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

FOUR GREAT EVILS OF THE DAY. Fifth edition. Paper, 2*s.* 6*d.*; cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

GLORIES OF THE SACRED HEART. Fourth edition. 6*s.*

GROUNDS OF FAITH. Seventh edition. Cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.*

HOLY GOSPEL OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN. With a Preface by His Eminence. 1*s.*

INDEPENDENCE OF THE HOLY SEE. Second edition. 5*s.*

INTERNAL MISSION OF THE HOLY GHOST. Fourth edition. 8*s.* 6*d.*

LOVE OF JESUS TO PENITENTS. Seventh edition 1*s.* 6*d.*

MISCELLANIES. 3 vols. 15*s.* the set.

PETRI PRIVILEGIUM. 10*s.* 6*d.*

PRAISE, A SERMON ON; with an Indulgenced Devotion. 1*s.*

SERMONS ON ECCLESIASTICAL SUBJECTS. Vols. I., II., and III., each 6*s.*

RELIGIO VIATORIS. Second edition. 2*s.* 6*d.*

SIN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES. Sixth edition. 6*s.*

TEMPORAL MISSION OF THE HOLY GHOST. Third edition. 8*s.* 6*d.*

TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE. Third edition. 5*s.*

TRUE STORY OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL. Second edition. 5*s.*

THE ETERNAL PRIESTHOOD. Seventh edition. Cloth 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE OFFICE OF THE HOLY GHOST UNDER THE GOSPEL. 1*s.*

BURNS & OATES, LTD., LONDON AND NEW YORK.

Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects.

BY

HENRY EDWARD,

CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

IN THREE VOLUMES, CLOTH, CROWN 8vo,
PRICE SIX SHILLINGS EACH.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

1. THE RELATION OF ENGLAND TO CHRISTIANITY.
2. HELP NEAREST WHEN NEED GREATEST.
3. DOGMATIC AUTHORITY SUPERNATURAL AND INFALLIBLE.
4. THE PERPETUAL OFFICE OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.
5. THE NAME AND PATIENCE OF JESUS.
6. THE CERTAINTY OF DIVINE FAITH.
7. STRENGTH IN WEAKNESS.
8. OCCISI ET CORONATI.
9. UNITY AND DIVERSITY THE PERFECTION OF THE CHURCH.
10. THE GOOD SHEPHERD.
11. THE MANTLE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD.
12. THE POWERS OF THE WORLD TO COME.
13. THE WEAPONS OF OUR WARFARE.
14. THE RESURRECTION OF THE DRY BONES.

BURNS & OATES, LTD., LONDON AND NEW YORK.

CARDINAL MANNING'S SERMONS (*continued*).

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

1. THE CHURCH, THE SPIRIT, AND THE WORD.
2. THE APOSTOLATE OF ST. VINCENT OF PAUL.
3. ST. VINCENT'S LOVE OF SOULS.
4. THE DEATH OF ST. VINCENT.
5. THE RESTORATION OF THE CHURCH OF ST. THOMAS.
6. THE BLESSED SACRAMENT THE CENTRE OF IMMUTABLE TRUTH.
7. THE MISSION OF ST. ALPHONSUS.
8. TRUTH BEFORE PEACE.
9. OMNIA PRO CHRISTO.
10. THE DISCIPLES OF THE HOLY GHOST.
11. OUR DUTY TO THE HEATHEN.
12. MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN A TEST OF LOVE.
13. THE NEGRO MISSION.
14. ST. EDMUND'S HEIRLOOM.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME III.

INTRODUCTION.

1. THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE IN ITS POLITICAL ASPECT.
2. ROME AND THE REVOLUTION.
3. CHRIST AND ANTI-CHRIST.
4. THE SYLLABUS.
5. POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO THE VATICAN COUNCIL.
6. ROME, THE CAPITAL OF CHRISTENDOM.
7. THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX. AND THE FEARS OF PETER.
8. THE DIVINE COMMONWEALTH.
9. THE TRIUMPH OF THE CHURCH.
10. THE GLORY OF THE CHURCH ALWAYS PROGRESSIVE.
11. THE DAY OF THE LORD.

BURNS & OATES, LTD., LONDON AND NEW YORK.

Crown 8vo, Cloth, 6s.

CHARACTERISTICS

FROM THE WRITINGS OF

THE MOST EMINENT HENRY EDWARD,

CARDINAL MANNING,

ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

Being Selections,

POLITICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL, AND RELIGIOUS,

FROM HIS VARIOUS WRITINGS.

ARRANGED BY

WILLIAM SAMUEL LILLY,

WITH THE AUTHOR'S APPROVAL.

Mr. W. S. Lilly, whose "Characteristics from the Writings of Cardinal Newman" has had so great a success—it has gone through six large editions—has prepared a similar volume of selections from the writings of Cardinal Manning. The book is divided into three sections—Political, Philosophical, and Religious. The Most Eminent Cardinal has not only approved warmly of Mr. Lilly's undertaking this task, but has given him such assistance as he required to execute it. The work thus comes before the public as directly expressing the mind of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster upon the grave topics with which it deals.

BURNS & OATES, Ltd., London and New York.